

THE Catholic Mind

OL. LII

FEBRUARY, 1954

NO. 1094

Peace Based on Justice

Most Rev. PATRICK A. O'BOYLE
Archbishop of Washington

*An address to the Catholic Association for International Peace,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1953*

THE preliminary discussions which led to the establishment of the Catholic Association for International Peace were held in connection with the International Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in the Summer of 1926. I like to think that this was not a mere coincidence. If it were a coincidence, it was indeed a most appropriate one, for the Eucharist, Who was honored at the Chicago Congress in 1926 more dramatically than ever before in the history of the United States, is the perfect symbol and the indispensable source of genuine peace within the home, the nation and the family of nations.

In the beautiful words which His

Holiness, Pope Pius XII, addressed to a National Eucharistic Congress in Brazil in 1942: "It is the function of Communion, the Divine Eucharist, overflowing with charity and brotherly love, as the Heart of Jesus, ever to increase love and unity between workers and employers, between the faithful and the clergy, between the subjects and the authorities, between North and South, between the citizens of the same state and among the states themselves, for the general weal . . ."

It was fitting and appropriate, therefore, that this organization should have come into being at an international religious gathering which, for the purpose of honoring

the Prince of Peace, brought together around a common altar representatives of every race and nation on the face of the earth, and thereby manifested more graphically than words could ever hope to do the unity of the human family and the universal brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. CAIP's diligent and highly intelligent efforts during the past quarter-century to promote the more effective application of this great principle of human brotherhood in the political, social and economic institutions of the emerging world community of nations are worthy of the highest commendation. I welcome this opportunity to offer congratulations on the good work the Association has already accomplished and to assure you of my prayerful best wishes for the continued success of its unselfish efforts to establish the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC REFORM

There is every reason to believe that the difficult work that you are doing will be more widely appreciated and more generously supported with the ever-increasing recognition on the part of American Catholics of the importance and the necessity of what the Papal encyclicals refer to as the reform of social, economic and political institutions. It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that the sanctification of individuals

is the indispensable foundation of social justice and international peace. Pius XI tells us, for example, in *Quadragesimo Anno*:

All the institutions for the establishment of peace and the promotion of mutual help among men, however perfect they may seem, have the principal foundation of their stability in the mutual bond of minds and hearts whereby the members are united with one another. If this bond is lacking, the best of regulations come to naught, as we have learned by too frequent experience. True cooperation will be possible for a single common good only when the constituent parts of society deeply feel themselves members of one great family and children of the same Heavenly Father; nay, that they are one body in Christ, "but severally members one of another," so that "if one member suffers anything, all the members suffer with it."

It is well to bear in mind, however, that Pius XI tells us earlier in the same encyclical—in a passage which is applicable in the field of international relations as well as in the field of domestic economic life—that "two things are especially necessary: reform of institutions and correction of morals."

The CAIP, relatively speaking, got off to a late start. Nevertheless it was ahead of its time in the United States in recognizing the necessity of combining the reform of international institutions with the reform of individuals. In 1926 comparatively few Americans were giving any serious thought to the problem of establish-

ing an adequate system of international institutions. The majority were not seriously concerned about the problem of international peace, or they innocently thought that it could be achieved as an incidental or automatic by-product of individual reform.

Since that time, because of the horrible experience of a second World War and the continuous threat of a third, because of the tireless efforts of the Holy See to spell out the institutional requirements of a just and lasting peace, and because of the quiet but effective work of scholarly organizations like the CAIP, more of us than ever before are now aware of the principle, as expressed by the late Cardinal Suhard of Paris, that "The duty of humanizing institutions and rendering the natural order receptive to grace has become an imperative obligation," and that "The salvation of persons cannot be accomplished without a certain 'salvation' of the social order."

Cardinal Suhard hastens to add—and very properly so—that in order to be effective our activities in the field of institutional reform "must proceed from the spirit of faith and a charity in action which necessitates enlightenment from Holy Scripture and dogma."

This, then, is the Catholic formula—the only authentic Catholic formula: the reform of social, economic, and political institutions in accordance with the principles of the natural law and, simultaneously, the reform and sanctification of individual souls. This is the formula which has been followed consistently by the CAIP during its brief but very fruitful life-time and is well exemplified in the rounded program which you are following during these busy days of your annual conference.

REVISION OF UN CHARTER

One of the principal institutional problems to which you are devoting your attention during this annual conference is the revision of the Charter of the United Nations. The Bishops of the United States have been concerned about this problem from the very beginning of the UN. As early as April 15, 1945 they called attention to some of the defects of the proposed Charter while it was still in draft form and before it was adopted at the San Francisco Conference. Six months later—on November 18, 1945—by which time the Charter had been adopted and the San Francisco Conference had adjourned, they issued another important statement on international re-

lations in which they presented the following very realistic appraisal of the Charter:

Our peace program envisions a world organization of nations. The Charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, does not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law. Nevertheless, our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos. From the provision in the Charter for calling a Constituent Assembly in the future, there comes the hope that in time the defects may be eliminated and we may have a sound, institutional organization of the international community which will develop, not through mere voluntary concessions of the nations, but from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

In 1954, for the first time, there may be a possibility of putting these recommendations of the Bishops into effect if a Constituent Assembly is convened for the purpose of revising the Charter. Whatever the CAIP can do in the meantime to throw further light on the subject of Charter revision and to focus public attention upon its importance will be a source of gratification to the Bishops and a significant contribution to the cause of world peace.

You will not expect me to say any

more about the problem of Charter revision at this time. I will merely express the hope that your conclusions will strike a happy balance between naive optimism on the one hand and cynical pessimism on the other. Even if the Charter of the UN is eventually revised, as we all hope it will be, the UN will not be an automatic panacea for all of the ills of the world community of nations. On the other hand, I think it would be fair to say that the UN, in spite of its imperfections and in spite of Soviet obstructionism, is, humanly speaking, the last best hope of international peace.

NO UTOPIAN DREAM

"A sound world organization," the Bishops of the United States remarked in their Statement of April 15, 1945, "is not a Utopian dream. . . . To yield to the fear that this thing cannot be done is defeatism. In nations, as well as in individuals, we must indeed face the fact of human weakness, but we must face it to conquer it; we must not accept it in a spirit of paralyzing fatalism. An opportunity is here, as in every world crisis, to begin a new era of genuine progress in the community of nations."

The proper Christian attitude towards the UN was well expressed, it seems to me, by the carpenter who made the ballot box which is used by the UN Security Council. His

prayer for peace—the first vote ever cast at the UN—was found by the tellers of the Security Council the first time the ballot box was opened. He himself had placed it in the box upon completing its construction. His prayer reads as follows: "May I, who have the privilege of making this ballot box, cast the first vote? May God be with every member of the United Nations Organization, and through your noble efforts bring lasting peace to us all—all over the world." I like to think that this humble craftsman was speaking for the majority of the human race when he composed this beautiful little prayer out of a heart filled with confidence in the sustaining grace of God, and confidence, too, in the intelligence and basic good-will of his fellow men all over the world. The fact that he happened to be a carpenter—if I may say so with proper reverence—strikes me as being a very happy, not to say symbolic, coincidence.

THE ILO

In lieu of entering into your discussion on the complicated details of Charter revision, I will confine myself to a hurried reference to the importance of economic and social reform as a necessary prerequisite for a lasting peace. Specifically, I would like to say a word on behalf of the International Labor Organization and on behalf of the various programs of Technical Assistance

which are generally lumped together under the heading of Point IV.

The ILO, as you know, is the only one of the specialized agencies of the Old League of Nations which survived the demise of the League and is now incorporated into the UN as an integral part of its structure. The ILO is not a perfect agency, but in these days when cynicism is such a common temptation even for the best of men it is well to bear in mind that the ILO, by reason of its many salutary accomplishments in the field of international labor legislation, is a living proof of the fact that it is possible for the nations of the world to cooperate with one another on behalf of the international common good—an effective antidote to the enervating virus of defeatism and despair.

The ILO has always enjoyed the support of the Catholic social movement. At the time of its establishment in 1919 it was enthusiastically endorsed by the Christian unions of Western Europe and by many other Catholic organizations in the field of social reform, and since that time has merited their continued support. On many occasions since 1919, we are told by Father Albert LeRoy, S.J., a member of the ILO Secretariat for twenty years, corresponding passages from the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* and the original charter of the ILO have been placed side by side in various kinds of synoptic

tables. The concordance between the two, he remarks, is freely recognized and appreciated on both sides. Pius XI explicitly called attention to this concordance in *Quadragesimo Anno*. "When after the great War," he said, "the rulers of the leading nations wished to restore peace by an entire reform of social conditions, and among other measures drew up principles to regulate the just rights of labor, many of their conclusions agreed so perfectly with the principles and warnings of Leo XIII as to seem expressly deduced from them."

The Labor Day edition of the *Catholic Standard*, the official newspaper of our own Archdiocese, featured a reproduction of a beautiful mural painting by the French artist, Maurice Denis, entitled, "The Dignity of Labor." Father Higgins, who supplied the editor of the *Catholic Standard* with a copy of this painting, tells me that the original hangs in a prominent position in the entrance hall of the International Labor Office in Geneva, Switzerland, a gift to the ILO from the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. I fully agree with Father LeRoy of the ILO Secretariat when he says that this beautiful mural would not be out of place in a church in one of our industrial cities. As a matter of fact, I would be pleased to have it for one of our own churches in Washington, which has the honor of being the headquarters of so many

worthwhile governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations dedicated to the great cause of social justice and international cooperation.

Be that as it may, Father LeRoy makes a very timely point when he says that this beautiful painting, which pictures our Blessed Saviour talking to a group of peasants, artisans and manual workers—some of them His own contemporaries, others intended by the artist to represent our own generation—explains more clearly than any lengthy speech could do the close and cordial relationship which has grown up on the basis of mutual respect between Catholics and the International Labor Organization. "Catholics," he concludes, "recognize in the Geneva institution a powerful force which can bring a little more justice into this world."

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

By the same token, Catholics recognize in Point IV and related programs of Technical Assistance another powerful force which, if properly used, can bring a little more justice into this world and thereby help to establish the foundation of a lasting peace. I am well aware of the fact that the whole subject of Technical Assistance is currently a rather controversial subject in the political arena. I have no intention of entering into this political controversy. I would like to express the

ies
ons
cial
on.
oy
he
ng,
our
nts,
me
ep-
ins
tech
ela-
the
een
oor
on-
in-
can
his
li-
ted
nce
if
ore
eby
of
of
y a
the
on-
the

hope, however, that some form of technical assistance, adequate in volume and properly regulated as to quality, will continue to be supported by the American people. All that I care to say at the present time about this important subject was stated very well in the 1953 Labor Day Statement of the NCWC Social Action Department:

Some of our impoverished allies in the cold war are beginning to suspect, perhaps with a certain degree of at least superficial justification, that we attach too much importance, relatively, to armaments and too little to economic assistance—too much importance, relatively, to bombers and battleships, too little to tractors and hybrid corn and elementary sanitary improvements for the disadvantaged people of the so-called underdeveloped areas. Let us hope and pray that the American people will quickly dispel these ominous fears and suspicions by continuing to keep faith with our national tradition of charity and generosity. We owe it to ourselves and to the rest of the world to be as generous as possible in administering the abundant riches which Almighty God has temporarily placed in our trust as stewards of his possessions and almoners of his gracious bounty.

To this prayer I would merely add the further hope—which our distinguished guest of honor, Bishop Lane of Maryknoll, would undoubtedly second—that the administrators of technical assistance programs will make every effort to respect the religious and cultural traditions of beneficiary peoples, and

that they will cooperate in every possible way with established religious organizations and missionary orders already working so effectively for God and for the cause of human betterment in the underdeveloped areas.

URGES PARTICIPATION BY CATHOLIC LAITY

I would also express the prayerful hope that the Catholic laity of the United States will assume their rightful share of responsibility for the successful administration of every worthwhile program in the field of international cooperation. We need many more qualified Catholics in the field of technical assistance and in every other field of international relations. May the graduates of our Catholic colleges and universities go into this important work in ever-increasing numbers out of the highest motives of Christian charity, inspired more by the positive love of God and neighbor than by a sterile hatred of Communism. I do not mean to suggest, of course, that the evil of Communism and the danger of the Communist menace can be lightly dismissed. Certainly not. On the other hand, a well-instructed Catholic laity can be expected to know that justice and charity are the standard, if not the only, weapons in the arsenal of Christianity.

Let me try to tell you very briefly, in conclusion, why I have chosen to

emphasize the importance of social and economic reform as a prerequisite of lasting international peace. If a third world war becomes necessary—and may God forestall such a devastating catastrophe—our soldiers and sailors will undoubtedly be the best equipped in the world. We can be certain of this, for the United States is the custodian of almost half the productive capacity in the world and, once again, has the high responsibility of being the "arsenal of democracy." But will our people be spiritually the best equipped in the world? Will we be the "arsenal of democracy" in the ideological and spiritual sense of the word? Will we excel in moral leadership and moral influence as we now excel in producing the instruments of military warfare?

The answer can be, Yes, if we are willing to sacrifice ourselves, in the name of Christ the King, to the peaceful pursuits of social justice, as our soldiers and sailors are willing to sacrifice themselves to the tragic pursuits of war. Communism can be defeated—and, if necessary, will be defeated—by superior force of arms. But Communism, as a diabolically false religion which has already captured the imagination, if not the total allegiance, of numerous Christians in Europe and even greater numbers of non-Christians in Asia, can only be displaced by something better. That something better is the Gospel

of Christ, not only as a body of dogmas and moral precepts, but as a total way of life—a way of life grounded in justice and permeated with the saving charity of Christ our Brother, the Vine of eternal life of which we are the branches.

As American Catholics, citizens of the most powerful democracy in the world, we are challenged at the mid-century to lift up our sights and to dedicate ourselves unselfishly to the great task of restoring society to Christ the King, whose empire, as Pius XI reminds us, extends to all men everywhere and to all the institutions of temporal society. "Nor is there any difference in this matter," he says, "between the individual and the family or the state; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ. In Him is the salvation of the individual, in Him is the salvation of society."

THE BISHOPS' PRAYER

To the end that all of us and all our fellow citizens may rise to this compelling challenge, I ask you to join with me in spirit as I close by reciting the beautiful prayer with which the Bishops of the United States concluded their 1946 Statement on "Man and the Peace":

In Christian solidarity, with humble hearts, we confess our sins and the sins of our race, and pleadingly beg through the merits of Christ, merci-

ful forgiveness from our Father Who is in heaven. Mindful of the sacred promise of the Saviour, we pray for light and strength for those who in our country bear the heavy responsibility of making decisions for us in the peace conferences; and, indeed, for all the peacemakers. May

the Saviour enlighten and strengthen them to imitate His blessed example and, in sacrifice and unselfishness, in the clear light of reason, secure for all men the enjoyment of their God-given rights, so that they may follow their vocation as sons of God and brothers in Christ.



Father Gillis and the U. N.

After facts, there are few things Father Gillis likes better than an argument. This week in an adjoining column he takes up a few points against the Indiana diocesan paper which accused him of "sniping at the U. N." The Indiana paper, in this case, is dead wrong—Father Gillis does not snipe at the U. N., he shoots point-blank from the roof-tops. The trouble with Father Gillis is simply that he aims at the wrong target.

Father Gillis, we must admit, has a right to be cynical; he has lived through days that were difficult and confused, which saw the triumph of evil in many quarters. In the face of it he finds it hard to appreciate that we should settle, even temporarily, for many things that are less than perfect. The United Nations is just that, something which needs the attention of men of good-will in order to be fashioned into an instrument worthy of its high purpose.

It is not fair to pretend, as Fr. Gillis does, that the Holy Father's interest in the United Nations lies in an ideal U. N. which in point of fact does not exist. Many times the present Pontiff has expressed his interest and given his encouragement and advice to the work of the U. N. now actually functioning. The Holy See has official status with at least one U. N. agency, and this very week Pope Pius sent there a monetary contribution with his blessing. The Pontiff is very much a realist in assessing the actual work of the U. N., not its mythical future.—THE PILOT, Boston, Mass., Nov. 21, 1953.

“Tribune” Journalism

*Reprinted from the CATHOLIC MESSENGER**

A COUPLE of weeks ago the Catholic Association for International Peace (a member of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference) met at Washington and, to our way of thinking, certainly “made news” by reason of the strong statements of speakers on behalf of the United Nations, international unity and world federalism.

It is no secret, of course, that many American Catholic editors are totally opposed to the United Nations and its various specialized agencies, notably UNESCO. Such editors lose no opportunity to develop among their readers an antagonistic attitude towards the UN and any tendencies toward world federalism, despite the massive and impressive evidence from the Vatican that our Holy Father is mightily interested in seeing the UN become a success and world federalism become a living reality.

We were interested, then, in seeing how the diocesan press would handle the news story of the CAIP meeting at Washington. One CAIP speaker (Father Edward Conway, S.J.) said that revision of the UN charter “in the direction of a federal world government is an immediate necessity.”

Another speaker (Archbishop Patrick O’Boyle of Washington) said that “the UN, in spite of its imperfections and in spite of Soviet obstructionism, is, humanly speaking, the last best hope of international peace.”

Yet a third speaker (Bishop John J. Wright of Worcester) said that “a titanic education task” must be undertaken to build up grassroots support for the United Nations, and that the response of Catholics to Papal leadership in “world-mindedness” has been “pathetically inadequate.”

Well, we ran a little private survey of the diocesan papers which come into our office each week.

Out of 37 newspapers, only 12 carried the CAIP story. Six of those 12 newspapers featured the CAIP story on their front pages; the others carried the story on the inside. But 25 of the papers, including *The Tidings* of Los Angeles and *The Tablet* of Brooklyn—two of the most vociferous opponents of what the *Tablet* derisively terms “one-worldism,” “bleeding-

* 410 1/3 Brady St., Davenport, Ia., Dec. 3, 1953.

heartism" and "do-goodism,"—did not carry a line of copy about what Archbishop O'Boyle, Bishop Wright and Father Conway had to say concerning the UN and international unity.

Many of the newspapers, however, including the two above, did carry in the same week the news story concerning Pope Pius XII's token gift of \$2,000 to the UN's Technical Assistance program, *The Tidings* printing it on page four, *The Tablet* on page 17.

HOW OBJECTIVE?

The big question raised by this little survey of one week's output in the diocesan press: "How objective is the diocesan press in handling the news?"

The absence of the CAIP story in one or two papers might have been an oversight on the part of a busy editor. Its absence in 25 out of 37 newspapers takes this situation, we think, out of the realm of happenstance.

A second question rises up: "Does an editor have the right to withhold from his readers stories containing viewpoints with which he personally disagrees?"

Last March, in his address on the need for adult education, Pope Pius XII spoke of the "international community" which, he said, "is becoming established." The Pope stressed the fact that Catholics throughout the world must educate themselves and their fellow men so that world citizens can begin to measure up to the juridical, political and social demands of this "international community."

Another question: If readers of certain diocesan newspapers are fed nothing but a diet of anti-UN and anti-world federalism propaganda and are not even confronted by the international-minded material which formed the stuff of the recent CAIP meeting in Washington, then how in this one-world of ours will American Catholics ever begin to do what Pius XII says is so urgently in need of doing?

Frankly, we are plenty heated up over the performance of the diocesan press in this and related matters. To us, we see little difference between this kind of journalism and the kind practised by the *Chicago Tribune*, except that when we find "Tribune journalism" in the Catholic press the tragedy takes on a deeper and graver significance.

There will always be, of course, an area of disagreement among editors concerning the "news-worthiness" and importance of a particular story. But, against the dreary backdrop of incessant anti-UN propaganda spread by huge sections of the diocesan press, it seems to us that the CAIP state-

ments established themselves as one of the most useful stories of the year.

As a postscript, we might add that we have secured the full texts of all the important addresses given at the Catholic Association for International Peace gathering and in future weeks we shall be publishing them in whole or at least in their salient parts.

We do not think a Catholic newspaper giving complete coverage to such events deserves any special praise. We think, rather, that such coverage should be the normal, ordinary response to genuinely significant stories. That such a response is, apparently, not normal or ordinary, reflects little credit on the diocesan press of this country.



Discrimination in Children's Health Problems

Anyone can see the sense of leaving the polio battle to the proper authorities, the public-health officials. Pray tell, why is it not equally sensible to let public-health authorities have control over public-health benefits for children?

Why should the Indianapolis Superintendent of Public Schools, for instance, take away the hearing-testing program for school children from the Board of Health, and proceed to rule out the pupils of the independent schools from this tax-supported service?

Deafness is just as hard on Catholic school children as on any others—but then it isn't catching like polio.

The growing tendency to put all matters affecting children under the control of the public-school system simply because it is a handy way of reaching the majority of children is working an increasing hardship on a minority.

Either special provisions should be made for the independent school pupils or a more sensible interpretation of Church-State separation is needed to let public-school authorities extend certain benefits to independent pupils—not to their schools.

We hardly think that America's sense of fair play will long tolerate discrimination in children's health problems. Separation of Church and State gets a worse than ridiculous meaning if it is invoked to justify the practice of protecting all children from epidemic diseases, but only public-school children from all other ailments.—*CATHOLIC TIMES, Columbus, Ohio, July 24, 1953.*

Case for World Federation

EDWARD A. CONWAY, S. J.
Associate Editor of AMERICA

*Reprinted from TODAY**

BACK in the 'twenties, when I was a carefree collegian, Hilaire Belloc gloomed that the future appeared so dark that he pitied anyone under the age of forty. If he were alive to read today's predictions of the experts, he would pity anyone under sixty-five. Said experts agree that there's an H-bomb in our future.

Now that even Sir Winston Churchill has all but abandoned hope of fruitful talks with the Russians, we must look forward, we are told, to ten to twenty years of the cold war. That means a continuing armaments race; and we have it on the best authority that Russia will be able to vaporize everything and everybody above ground in three years or so.

As the realization of that fact sinks in, we may expect ever more frantic efforts to increase our *passive* defense and improve our *active* defense. Of course our passive defense, radar fences, interceptors, passive defensive missiles and the like, cannot be expected to give us absolute security. In fact, as Hanson Baldwin,

the military expert, wrote recently: "the erection of one type of defensive system—the type that might provide optimum security against air attack by piloted planes—might well become obsolete, even before it was completed, in the coming age of intercontinental missiles." (Let's not mention snorkel submarines with atomic-missile launchers.) Meanwhile, we'll be building up our *active* defense, the power of our strategic air force to retaliate at once—but at once.

Then, says Mr. Baldwin, "with an improved defense and a strong offense, there may be hope that the horrible implications of H-bomb warfare will prevent the use of such mass weapons of destruction." Mr. Baldwin does not stop there, as I will shortly show, but many of our so-called leaders do. That is the only future they offer you. It is a peaceful future resulting from "a balance of terror." It is peace brought about by "armed equilibrium." It is the peace enjoyed by "two scorpions in a bottle," as famed physicist J. Ro-

* 638 Deming Pl., Chicago 14, Ill., December, 1953.

bert Oppenheimer described it. We are being conditioned to accept that future by molders of global opinion like Sir Winston Churchill, who told the House of Commons recently:

I have sometimes the odd thought that the annihilating character of these agencies may bring an utterly unforeseeable security to mankind. . . . When the advance of destructive weapons enables everyone to kill everybody else, nobody will want to kill anyone at all.

Indeed, that is an odd thought. It is clearly at odds with what we know about psychology. How long does Mr. Churchill think two giant blocs will be able to stand the strain of this "balance of terror"? How long could you? The Westerners, of course, will tell the Russians just what horrors they are hatching, and will learn sooner or later how the Russians are matching them. The inevitable upshot will be an international nervous breakdown; the first side to lose its head will loose its bombs.

Don't blame our defense-planners for this frightful future. They are just doing their job. It is our peace-planners who are not doing theirs. As Mr. Baldwin concluded in his article:

More and more it is apparent, as the atomic arms race increases its tempo, that the first line of defense in this era of danger must be political and psychological; to lessen the causes of international tension, to prevent the outbreak of a world war, to limit it if it comes.

The only sure way of doing all three is to stop this suicidal atomic-hydrogen competition.

SUSPICION WIDESPREAD

At the United Nations, the suspicion is widespread that the reason both East and West are still even talking about disarmament is for propaganda purposes. The United States still insists that the Soviets accept the now obsolete "Baruch" plan for atomic disarmament. In the last session of Congress, Senator Flanders of Vermont introduced a resolution on disarmament asking the President to appoint a commission to take a new look at the problem. In a statement reported by AP on October 20 he said he had protested to the President that the State Department had got the Senate to drop that section. As far as planning for peace is concerned, there is justice in the Senator's charge that the Department seems to resemble the Arctic tundra. "Flowers bloom on the surface, but if you dig down a few feet you strike eternal ice." Elsewhere, fortunately, the fields are whitening for the harvest. Private citizens have been the husbandmen.

Leading them all has been Grenville Clark, prominent New York lawyer, who was largely responsible for the "Plattsburg Idea" of training officers for the First World War and for the Selective Service Bill of 1940. I first met Mr. Clark at the

so-called Dublin Conference at Dublin, N. H., in October, 1945, when a group of political and atomic scientists met to discuss ways of strengthening the United Nations in view of the perils of the new atomic age. Mr. Clark has been working on the problem ever since. In *A Plan for Peace* (Harper's, 1950) he warned that neither governments nor officials could be relied upon to initiate the far-reaching improvements in the UN Charter the atomic age demands. Those in authority, he said, are likely to be so much preoccupied with day-to-day problems, so inhibited by tradition, or so apprehensive of being ahead of current opinion, that they will be incapable of formulating and advocating the great steps forward in world organization that the atomic age requires. In all probability, he added, the necessary ideas must come from the people themselves.

Those ideas are coming from the people, in varying degrees of clarity and consistency. I personally believe that the clearest and most consistent ideas are those proposed by United World Federalists, Inc., of which Mr. Clark is a vice-president. Since the action program of UWF is based largely on his ideas, which he is now elaborating under a grant of the Ford Foundation, let me summarize them.

In Mr. Clark's thought, disarmament is the key to any stable world settlement and a system of world or-

der. While it may not alone achieve those goals, it is a *sine qua non* of genuine peace. It must be not only universal and enforceable, but *complete*, right down to the level of strictly limited and lightly-armed forces for internal order only. Any-one who engages the problem closely admits that unless *all* the nations disarm, none of them will. It is just as obvious that disarmament must be enforceable—as fool-proof as humanly possible. Unless the nations believe that, they will not join the system. Mr. Clark insists that disarmament must also be complete, and cites history as proof that reduction or regulation or control will bog down in endless disputes about quotas and the "needs" of the Powers.

A PACKAGE DEAL

Progressing logically, Mr. Clark shows that world political and legal institutions are indispensable to disarmament. The nations of the world must accept those limitations of their sovereignty which will keep them from murdering one another. The most practicable way of getting those institutions is by development of the United Nations, in which they are found in embryo. The chance to develop the UN will come in the Charter Review Conference, which will almost certainly be held in 1955 or 1956.

Mr. Clark, in a word, proposes a package deal. If we want effective

disarmament, we must accept a certain number of fundamental changes in the Charter. It is not a question simply of abolishing the veto, or of codifying international law, important as those improvements may be. It is not enough to tinker with the Charter; we must transform it to insure effective disarmament, the only guarantee of a durable peace.

This transformation must bring about a federal government with strictly limited powers. The General Assembly must be changed into a legislature, preferably unicameral, with authority to make laws. The Security Council must be made into a responsible executive to carry out the will of the legislature in matters concerning the maintenance of peace. The International Court of Justice must be given jurisdiction over all cases arising under the laws enacted, that jurisdiction extending not only to governments but to individuals. That, essentially, is the shape of the transformation of the United Nations which must take place to assure effective disarmament. It should be added, of course, that the Executive Council must have adequate civilian inspection forces and adequate police forces to insure that the laws of disarmament are respected.

This package deal is sponsored not only by the American World Federalists, but by the World Movement for World Federal Government, a federation of about thirty

national federalist groups. This worldwide organization held its Fourth Congress in Rome in 1951, and delegates to it were received in audience by the Holy Father on April 6, 1951. Much to their surprise, the Holy Father mounted His throne, took a manuscript from his pocket and delivered a formal address in French on the subject of world government. He left no doubt as to his sympathies with the movement which the delegates represented. His remarks have been widely publicized, but little heeded by Catholics. I charged a year ago that they were giving him the same silent treatment that the contemporaries of Leo XIII accorded to the encyclical *The Condition of Labor*. In turn, I have been charged with misinterpreting his address. I still consider it an expression of Papal approval of the world government movement as represented by His auditors.

My interpretation is borne out, I believe, by an unprejudiced reading of such parts of his text as these:

Your movement dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the Church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armaments race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their

resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you mean that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the Church. (Italics mine.)

CATHOLIC OPPONENTS

I have been amazed at the lengths to which Catholic opponents of world government have gone to minimize the clear meaning of the Papal text. No, the Pope didn't once mention world government, but he addressed his audience as "members of the World Movement for World Federal Government." He knew what they stood for. He spoke of "an effective political organization of the world," of those "who dream of setting up a world parliament." If he considered the present UN effective, would he have said: "it is necessary to *arrive* at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armaments race"? He certainly wasn't talking about some future armaments race; therefore he must have been approving his hearers' immediate objectives.

As a matter of fact, the Holy Father consented to receive the world federalists only after a complete explanation by an Italian federalist close to the Vatican, Dr. A. Milo di Villagrazia. The Pope knew they in-

sisted on a *limited, federal* government. "You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form." His audience received his warnings against "*unitarisme mecanique*" as confirmation of the soundness of their insistence on the federal principle. That phrase, "Mechanical unitarism," (which one diocesan newspaper insisted on calling "mechanical unitarianism") is common in French literature on the social sciences. It refers to the loss of personal independence and cultural diversities in the totalitarian state, to the destruction of what the Holy Father called the "normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples."

The world federalists emphasize vigorously the principle of federalism. Grenville Clark, for example, insists that the powers of the strengthened United Nations should be restricted *directly* to the prevention of war.

The policy statement of United World Federalists is even more explicit: it calls for "the reservation to the nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, thus guaranteeing to each nation complete internal sovereignty to manage its domestic affairs, and freedom to choose its own domestic political, economic, social and religious institutions."

Many fears of opponents of world federal government arise from ignorance of the principle of federalism—and this despite the fact that they themselves live under a federal form of government.

WORLD MOVEMENT CONGRESS

On the other hand, I found, when I attended the Fifth Congress of the World Movement in Copenhagen last August, that the delegates not only understood but defended the federal principle the Holy Father had insisted on at Rome.

I was curious to meet the leaders of the World Movement. I had been warned that they were Communists. A few French fellow-travelers, who urged collaboration with the Communist-dominated Partisans for Peace, were squelched by the leader of the American delegation, a Unitarian minister. The World Movement met jointly in the Danish Parliament with seventy members of the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government. These are all tremendous titles, to be sure, but they serve to emphasize that the movement for revision of the UN Charter is truly world-wide. The British Parliamentary Group for World Government, for example, numbers no fewer than sixty-three M.P.'s from all parties. The parliamentarians I heard during the debates argued strongly for the principle of federation. In general, they

showed far more knowledge of the problems of world organization than do most members of our own Congress.

United World Federalists, Inc., wants to enlighten our legislators. They want them within the next two years to declare that revision of the UN Charter into the constitution of a government such as we enjoy is a fundamental objective of U.S. policy. To quote their policy statement again:

A first step toward the revision of the UN into a world federal government would be to make this objective a fundamental purpose of the foreign policy of the United States, supported by the American people and their elected representatives . . .

It is being alleged that the United States is losing the "war of ideas" because it is not presenting the ideas the great mass of mankind wants to hear. Mankind wants to know how we propose to abolish war, how to assure to each nation its right to develop its internal affairs free from external dictation, and how it can raise its standard of living. We world federalists argue that if the U.S. honestly offers our program, the non-Soviet nations will give it their full support.

There is some chance that the U.S. will do so. Already John Foster Dulles has announced that the United States will vote for a charter review conference in 1955. The Senate has set up a Foreign Relations subcom-

mittee under Senator Wiley to study charter revision. On August 26 Secretary Dulles told the American Bar Association at its Boston convention that the UN Charter must be "altered in some important respects," because it "now reflects serious inadequacies."

The World Federalists are convinced that, as the scientists dream up ever more horrible engines of annihilation, more and more Americans will join them in demanding that the UN Charter be altered in a number of really important respects. If the demand is loud and clear enough, Congress will pay heed to it. And if Congress insists that the U.S. dele-

gation to the UN must sponsor true transformation of the Charter, not just tinkering with it, other member nations will rally to its cause; so many, in fact, that Russia will have to put up or shut up. If she insists on vetoing the proposal, then, say the federalists, the free nations will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that they tried, as Mr. Dulles once put it, to "develop international order to shield national life." Then they will be able to proceed with a clear conscience to organize a federation of the free so powerful as to provide at least the possibility that Russia will not dare to attack it.



"Talking About Communism"

Not long ago we heard someone express the sage comment that perhaps the safest job in America today is the job of attacking the Communists in our midst. It is fashionable. Everybody seems to be against them—just as everybody is against tuberculosis.

But fighting tuberculosis on paper or in a test tube is scientific and respectable. Fighting tuberculosis by fighting against slums, against unsanitary working conditions, against low wages and job insecurity—do this and even the nicest people will think that you are something of a radical or a "Red." But tuberculosis is not curbed by working only with paper and a test tube. Nor is Communism. Communism is alive, and like all things alive it must be destroyed at its roots. But its roots are deeply buried in unhappiness, injustice, insecurity, in the dry rot of uncreative labor, in the frustration of idleness, in the haunting helplessness of the neglected and the poor. With the eloquence of Cicero you may marshall all the devastating arguments against Communism, but you will never destroy it without first destroying the intolerable injustices in which it breeds.—*The Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly in SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN, Hartford, Conn., Nov. 15, 1953.*

The Church in Norway

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from THE TABLET**

AT TRONDHEIM last July 26, Cardinal Griffin was present at the celebration of the eighth centenary of the establishment of Norway's first Metropolitan See; an occasion which the Holy Father has marked by elevating the Apostolic Vicariate of Oslo to the status of a Diocese, appointing Bishop Mangers, the Vicar Apostolic, to be the first Ordinary of the new See. It will be recalled that the Holy Father similarly marked the Danish Catholic Convention, in May, by elevating the Vicariate Apostolic of Denmark into the Diocese of Copenhagen, which then became the first Diocese in Scandinavia since the Reformation.

The city of Trondheim—or, to give it its old name, Nidaros—is built in a fjord, where the river Nid runs to the sea: it is the heart of Christian Norway, with a splendid cathedral, one of the finest Gothic buildings in Scandinavia—now, of course, Lutheran—in which is the tomb of the national patron, St. Olaf, and in which the Norwegian kings are crowned. The foundation of the See in 1153 is due to an Englishman,

Cardinal Nicholas Breakspear, who in the following year became Pope as Adrian IV, the only English Pope in the history of the Church. He had landed at Stavanger in 1152 as the Legate of Eugene III, and in 1153 he presided over a *Riksmöte*, or national convention, at Nidaros, at which were present the three royal brothers, Oystein, Sigurd and Inge, together with the Bishops and other representatives of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. This convention led to the separation of the Church from the civil power and the establishment of the ecclesiastical authority of the Papacy, to the introduction of a canonical organization in conformity with the laws of the Universal Church, and to comprehensive reforms which had far-reaching effects on the national life. For Church and State alike it was the beginning of a new chapter in Norwegian history.

The Archbishop of Lund, then a Danish city, and earlier the Archbishops of Hamburg and Bremen, had until this time exercised jurisdiction over the Norwegian Bishops,

but this was now given to the Archbishop of Nidaros, and the principle of Norwegian independence was recognized. The new See had jurisdiction over the Dioceses of Bergen, Oslo, Stavanger and Hamar; Cardinal Breakspear founded the latter in the same year, and to him is due the magnificent cathedral there whose ruins Cardinal Griffin visited last week. He also gave the Archbishop of Nidaros jurisdiction over the Church in Iceland, Greenland, the Hebrides and Orkneys, and the Isle of Man, and caused the foundation of cathedral schools in Trondheim, Bergen and Oslo which became the centers of Norwegian culture in the Middle Ages. It was a great turning-point in the national history when Cardinal Breakspear himself invested with the pallium Jon Birgisson, the first Norwegian Archbishop.

UNITY AND INDEPENDENCE

"These," wrote the present Vicar Apostolic of Oslo, in his Pastoral Letter for Lent, 1953, "were events of far-reaching importance. The creation of the Archiepiscopal See at Trondheim, which meant that Norway became a separate ecclesiastical province, was particularly important, not only as a milestone in the history of the Catholic Church in Norway, but as the safest basis of Norwegian unity and independence, of religious and cultural development, and of incorporation into the sphere

of European culture. We may safely feel that this was the best thing that the Holy See has done or could do for Norway. Only thus did Norway become a fully united and completely independent nation, on an equal footing with the other nations of Christian culture."

Not only was the national identity of Norway as it were born in this manner with the hierarchy of the Catholic Church; it also perished at the Reformation when the hierarchy perished. With the enforced exile of the last Archbishop, Olaf Engelbrktsson, in 1537, the hierarchy came to an end, and with it the Norwegian Empire of the Middle Ages. The country lost its national independence, and was united with Denmark, in a union which lasted until 1814. By the supreme order of the Danish King, the Lutheran faith was imposed on the people, not for religious but for political reasons, and without any popular support. The Reformation was imposed with great thoroughness, and for three centuries the few Catholics remaining in Norway had to go to the Netherlands for the Sacraments. Eventually, in the year 1842, a group of Catholics in Oslo—all of foreign extraction, but all of Norwegian nationality—applied to King Karl-Johan, then the common sovereign of Norway and Sweden, for permission to form a Catholic parish in the Norwegian capital, and for full liberty of wor-

ship. Temporary permission was granted in the following year, and the legal recognition of freedom of worship came only with the "Dissidents' Law" of 1845: even then there were some reservations, and one of these, directed against the Society of Jesus, endures to this day.

It is a sign, perhaps, of a certain hardening of sentiment against the Catholic Church that almost on the eve of the celebrations at Trondheim there came an announcement that the *Storting*, or Parliament, had decided not to proceed with the proposal for a Constitutional amendment which would permit the Jesuits to return to Norway. The prohibition against them dates from the Constitution of May 31, 1814 of which the second Article not only established the Lutheran Church but concluded: "The Jesuit and other monkish Orders shall not be tolerated. Jews, furthermore, are excluded from the country." The ban against Jews was lifted in 1851, and in 1897 the phrase about "other monkish Orders" was deleted, but the Jesuits are excluded from Norway to this day. For this reason a special reservation had to be made when Norway ratified the European Convention on Human Rights, at Strasbourg, in December, 1951. Many Norwegians felt some embarrassment at this, and the proposal to amend the Constitution in favor of the Jesuits was brought forward so that that Convention might be ac-

cepted without qualification. It found widespread support, including some support from dignitaries of the Lutheran Church. But now it has been dropped, and, says Gunnar Hoff, Secretary-General of the *Storting*, it will not be possible to bring it forward again until January, 1955.

CELEBRATIONS HELD

But this arrival in Norway of a Papal Legate and future Pope is being commemorated by the Lutherans as enthusiastically as if he had never been to Rome. The State Radio broadcast a talk on the Catholic Church in Norway by Fr. Ivar Hansteen Knudsen, who is secretary to the Bishop in Oslo and editor of an excellent Catholic monthly, which has a circulation far bigger than the numbers of the Norwegian Catholics would suggest. And no sooner had the Catholic celebrations come to an end than the Lutheran celebrations began, with King Haakon and other members of the royal family going to Trondheim, the Bishops of London and Sodor and Man representing the Church of England, and the Moderator of the Church of Scotland also present.

Cardinal Griffin, for his part, flew to Norway on Tuesday, July 21, being received by King Haakon on arrival. He was solemnly received in the church of St. Olaf in Trondheim the following Saturday evening, but that church is not large enough to accommodate

all who had assembled, and on Sunday morning there was a procession from it to the Technical High School, where Cardinal Griffin sang the High Mass. In the evening, in the same premises, there was a meeting at which he delivered the address quoted below, and this was followed by an informal reception in the Chamber of Commerce.

PILGRIMAGE TO STIKLESTAD

Then on Monday morning, slightly anticipating the feast of St. Olaf, which fell on Wednesday, Cardinal Griffin made the pilgrimage to Stiklestad, where St. Olaf died in battle in the year 1030. St. Olaf was baptized at Rouen in 1010, and, succeeding to the throne of Norway five years later, at once summoned missionaries, chiefly from England, to complete the conversion of his country. He showed considerable severity in his religious zeal, was driven out of the country, and was eventually killed at Stiklestad while trying to recover his throne. He has always been regarded by the Church as a martyr, and by the Norwegians as a national patron. Here at Stiklestad Cardinal Griffin was present at a Mass offered in honor of St. Olaf by Bishop Ruth, the Vicar Apostolic of Central Norway (whose Vicariate was raised from a Prefecture earlier this year). Then he returned to Trondheim for the closing ceremonies in the church of St. Olaf.

"It is with great pride and pleasure," the Cardinal declared when he spoke on Sunday evening, "that I bring to the people of Norway the greetings of the hierarchy and faithful of England and Wales. We offer our warm congratulations to the Vicars Apostolic and the Prefect Apostolic upon this great centenary which is being celebrated here today. The bonds of affectionate friendship between our two countries have never been closer than at the present time." His Eminence observed that he had "a very special reason" for being present in Trondheim: "Nicholas Breakspear was born at Abbots Langley, which lies within my Archdiocese. . . . Indeed, upon the site of the house where he was born there is to this day an ancient building known as Breakspear Farm." The Cardinal went on to recall that the future Pope always remained in touch with the place of his birth, and that when he came to Rome as the envoy of Eugene III, *en route* for Norway, he went to Abbots Langley to visit his mother, "and his father, who, by special permission, was serving as a lay-brother in the monastery of St. Albans." In the same monastery the future Pope had himself sought admission to the Benedictines and had been refused.

The Cardinal went on to compare the fate of the Church in England and in Norway, speaking of the Reformation in both countries and of the Catholic revival and the res-

toration of the hierarchy in England. In Norway the revival has been slower, and today there are only about 5,000 Catholics there, in a population of some $3\frac{1}{4}$ millions. The Cathedral Church of Bishop Mangers in Oslo is the smallest in Europe, seating only 200 people; while in the Central Vicariate there are only 240 Catholics in a population of nearly half a million. Of the 40 priests serving the Church in Norway, only 11

are Norwegian, and of these 8 are converts—including Fr. Thoralf Nørheim, who was ordained as a Dominican in 1950, the first Norwegian member of his Order since the Reformation. In that same year Fr. Anton Taxt became the first Norwegian to be ordained as a diocesan priest for fifty years. Yet, as Cardinal Griffin declared at Trondheim, "numbers are not important; it is the Faith which counts."



The Acids of Modernity

The most disturbing feature about the acids of modernity is that they paralyze and rot the human will and the very roots of spiritual life from which resistance and renewal must come. The scientists are right, perhaps, in saying that our civilization is unique in being able to diagnose the cause of its decay, though we can hardly imagine what consolation it would afford a man dying of cancer to be versed in the phases of that dread disease, for which no cure has yet been found. Our civilization is unique for a far higher reason: it is the only Christian civilization in history. "The West," as Karl Adam wrote, "is still the privileged place of divine blessings, where the grace of Christ has not remained without witness." He added: "If ever Western spirituality is to be restored all along the line to a Christian sense, this only can be achieved by retracing its steps along the false road. *Retournez à la nature*, Rousseau once exclaimed: now the call goes out to the West: 'Back to the supernatural!'"

There are happily many hearts as yet uncorroded by the acids of modernity. They must make endless supplication for those other hearts where the image of God has been obliterated, since, as the Spanish proverb says in a tone of real Christian optimism: "Where the Devil has erased, there can God write again."—*Liam Brophy in THE CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART, Toronto, Can., October, 1953.*

Avoiding World War III

L. J. TWOMEY, S.J.

Director, Institute of Industrial Relations, Loyola University,
New Orleans, La.

*An address to the Southern Conference of the A.F.L. Teamsters,
Biloxi, Miss., April 20, 1953.*

I NEED not tell you that we are passing through one of the greatest crises in history. No informed person can possibly doubt that we of the Western world are engaged in a struggle for survival against a powerful and ruthless enemy vowed to destroy all that we have known and loved. With atomic weapons actually in the arsenals of the principal protagonists, the implications of this struggle assume staggering proportions. If the issue is to be settled only by the West meeting the East in total war, there is likelihood that most of us won't be around when the last hydrogen bomb will have annihilated the last city. At that time, future prospects might well induce the minority who may somehow survive to regret that they too had not perished.

These are harsh facts—none of us likes them—but we must face up to them honestly and courageously or risk disaster in our failure.

As intelligent men and women, as leaders in your respective communities and as members of an important organization in our economy, it

would do your souls and your country an immeasurable amount of good to consider what contribution you can make toward averting the catastrophe of a third world war. Let us examine this urgent matter.

In my opinion, there are two principal problems which must be solved if there is to be any hope of avoiding another global war. The first problem is that of the hitherto inarticulate masses of the world's population. Throughout the world there is an intense unrest among these masses. In some areas it has expressed itself in bloody uprisings, in others it remains a time-bomb ready to explode at any time. This unrest has its source in the determination of tens of millions not to be any longer on the receiving end of political, economic and social policies in the formulation of which they have had no voice. In other words, the days when the small minority could impose its will on the vast majority are passing, and they are passing fast.

Let us examine this matter more carefully. How did we get into the

horrendous mess we're in? Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, an inept handling of our foreign policy, one may reply. These are easy answers and at best only partially true. But this is the type of answer with which too many Americans rest satisfied. The result is that we are prone to shift the blame on others than ourselves and become almost entirely negative in our estimate of how we got where we are. It is true that we have been guilty of frightening blunders in our foreign affairs, which have undoubtedly aggravated the seriousness of the present crisis. Yet, we can combine all the stupidity and all the real and imaginary disloyalty in the conduct of our foreign policy with all the astute rascality of the Kremlin, and still come up with vital missing links in the chain of causes which have led to where we are today. To find these missing links is a work of transcendent importance. The process will assuredly not be easy on our pride and complacency.

May I suggest that Communism is an effect and not a cause? If you remember this and forget all else that I have said and will say, I will be satisfied that my remarks today will have had a measure of success. Communism is the effect of the gigantic spiritual, political, economic and social failures of what we are fond of calling Western Civilization. There is not time to specify these failures here. But they constitute the seamy

side of our way of life. They are the contradictions which make our profession of Christian democracy give off a hollow sound. They are the ready-made instruments we are placing in Communist hands to undermine our position throughout the world. These failures have created the voids in millions of men's souls as well as their stomachs. And into these voids Communism is rushing with damnable false, but nonetheless effective, promises of all sorts.

CASE OF CHINA

Take the case of China. To say that Communism is the primary cause of what happened there is to my mind utterly unrealistic. Communism in China and in the Far East generally is capitalizing on the centuried-cumulative resentment of those oriental people against their exploitation by white Europeans and white Americans. The whirlwind sown in the name of British, French, Dutch and even American imperialism we are now reaping, and a tragic harvest it is. For decades and even centuries, the colonial and imperialistic policies of the powerful western nations have reduced tens of millions of native populations to the level of mere instruments to fatten the profits of their European and American overlords. Within recent times, the sons of these exploited nations have been coming to American and European universities. In many instances, the more

they learned the more they came to hate us for the enormity of the exploitation which we westerners have foisted on their peoples.

A similar situation prevails in the Near East where Iran, Iraq, Egypt, to speak of no others, are inflamed with almost wild resentment against the British and even against us.

A new era is in the pangs of birth. Are we wise enough to realize what is happening, and are we big enough to accept the change for what it is: a deeply-rooted love of freedom on the part of formerly subject nations? Can we meet the challenge and adjust our thinking and acting accordingly?

IMPACT ON THE SOUTH

A fair test of this, it seems to me, is our reaction to the impact of this world problem on the South. In the first place it needs to be said that the South is one of the most important regions in the world. The fact that it has the highest birth-rate in the United States, and that it is America's most rapidly expanding industrial area, gives the South this fateful position in the most important nation on earth. In large measure, then, as the South goes, so goes America; and as America goes, so goes the world.

The uprising among the hitherto subject peoples of the world impinges on the South through the labor movement. This is so because our working classes in great degree constitute our inarticulate masses. What the South

does relative to labor has immediate repercussions in the field of international relations.

If there were time, I should very much like to analyze for you what I consider the basic political, economic and social attitudes which still characterize a large and significant segment of Southern thinking. Suffice it to say, that among many of our political and economic leaders there is much sentimental attachment to the aristocratic pattern of politics, and to the spirit of plantation paternalism that harks back to the pre-Civil War era. In the old South there were the few at the top, who dictated political, economic and social life in such a way as to protect their acquired position of dominance. Happily, things have undergone a great change. Yet, the old South projects itself measurably into the new South, through ingrained pre-conceptions and prejudices.

One of the baneful effects of this throw-back to the past is the existence of a definite anti-union bias in the average Southern industrialist, businessman and banker. You know this as well or better than I. But I am wondering whether you are adequately prepared to answer this real challenge. Are you relying on force to meet force, or are you developing statesmanship in labor leadership?

Yes, I know how difficult it is to be a statesman when you are dealing with an employer who is striving to

deprive his employes of their God-given, legally-guaranteed rights to join unions. I am not criticizing you for being tough in a good sense, nor for being unwilling to take these things lying down. But I do say you must go far beyond a justifiable defense of the rights and privileges which are yours as sons of God and citizens of America. You must constructively seize the offensive and build soundly and sanely a mighty labor movement which will give reasonable expression to the hitherto inarticulate masses of our fellow Southerners. But more, much more. You must build this labor movement into a tremendous force for the good of your employers, for the good of the South, and for the good of America.

Such a rightly-conceived and well-executed organization of our Southern workers will create a source of influence so great as to cross international frontiers with the message to exploited peoples everywhere that Christian democracy is still the vital, vibrant thing we claim it to be. Yes, the price of such a movement is great—but the reward is infinitely greater....

INTERRACIAL PROBLEM

If your memory serves you well, you will recall that I mentioned a second world problem, which merges importantly with the first.

Some weeks ago a very important meeting was held in New York. At

that meeting one of the speakers gave the breakdown of the world's population. He roughly divided it into three groups of 800 million each. One group is under the domination of that vicious, diabolical thing called Communism. In passing I should like to add that I am happy to know that the Teamsters Union is singularly free of those worst enemies of the labor movement, the Communists.

The second 800 million are with us, so to speak, the Western world, the democratic world so-called.

The remaining 800 million are as yet uncommitted. The overwhelming majority of this group are members of non-white races. Thus we are faced with the second great world problem, the problem of interracial relations. Many of you may not want me to talk about this subject. I don't like to have to bring it up either. For I agree with Adlai Stevenson when in New Orleans last September he made one of the most pertinent observations on this problem I have ever heard. In effect, Stevenson said that all of us must certainly regret the tragedy of even having to talk about human rights after 2,000 years of Christianity.

But we must talk about human rights.

I have already sketched for you the great danger that threatens us all. Do you recognize that if we are going to survive, if we are going to win this

battle for freedom, if human decency is going to be preserved in the world, we simply must gain the loyal allegiance of at least a majority of the third 800 million? Will we do this? I don't think so unless we are willing to face the problems of interracial relations with an open mind and understanding heart. It is quite obvious, is it not, that we are not going to win any friends among those 800 million non-whites by saying—and loudly—that we, the members of the white race, are the superior people, and they, members of colored races, are only second-class, inherently backward people. What disastrous consequences our policy of white-supremacy has caused are apparent to all with eyes to see.

I am a Southerner—I was born and raised in the South. And I now stand before you and testify that I yield to no man in my loyalty to the things that are decently Southern. But I also testify before this convention that there are many features in our Southern laws, traditions and customs of which no right-thinking Southerner can be proud. In our political, economic and social life there are vast distortions of right order, grave violations of justice. If the price of being considered a loyal Southerner is to go along with these distortions and violations, I for one refuse to pay the price. Do we have to be grossly unfair to gain the title of loyalty? Do we have to stifle our

sense of human decency in order to qualify as a true Southerner? God forbid! And yet there are too many Southerners who seem to think so.

On many occasions in the past, I have expressed myself as I am doing now. For my pains, I have been called a "nigger lover," a "racial fanatic," a "dangerous man," and even a "red in robes." I do not fear such intemperate epithets. But what I do fear is that the gross injustices which are inherent in our interracial relations in the South may, unless quickly remedied, so undermine our position before the throne of God, as well as before the court of world opinion, as to bring down upon us the avenging wrath of an angry God and of an outraged mass of colored humanity.

Let us take another look at the Far East for a moment. We are in serious trouble there. And again we are quick to blame the politicians for it all. But let's give this matter a second thought. Our young American military men—God bless them—go to the Far East. They may be brave—as most of them are. They may be devoted to America—as most of them are. But many of them are quite stupid. To them the Koreans are "Gooks," the Chinese, "Chinks," the Filipinos, "Flips." These may be smart labels for the brash young American soldier, but they burn the souls of these oriental peoples.

Where lies the guilt? Certainly not

all on the soldier, for he is a victim of his environment back in the States. Maybe he grew up in areas where "nigger" for the Negro, or "kike" for the Jew, or "wop" for the Italian, or "mick" for the Irish, or "greaser" for the Mexican were current expressions even among so-called genteel folk. Then again he may have gotten the idea from some of his elders that being an Anglo-Saxon is the only title to superiority. Whatever may be the explanation, it is certain that the speech and conduct of Americans, military and civilian, wherever they may be, are in large measure an accurate reflection of the customs and culture in the United States. And this does give us plenty to worry about.

Logically or illogically—it makes no practical difference—tens of millions among the non-white races identify the treatment we are according the Negro with the kind they would receive if the world were ever to be made over according to our image. The peoples of Iran, Iraq, Egypt, French Morocco in the Near East, and of China, Indonesia, Malaya, Indo-China, India in the Far East are cases in point. No deep knowledge of psychology is needed to understand why these nations have been slightly less than enthusiastic about enrolling under our standard.

And now let us look to our own attitudes toward Negro-white relations. We talk a lot about fair play, about human freedom, about inalien-

able rights. We say these are the things for which America stands. How sincere are we in all this? Let's put ourselves to the test. The Golden Rule reads simply, doesn't it? "Do unto others as we would have others do unto us." But how willing are we to be done by as we do to the Negro? That question is for each of us to answer within the sacred privacy of his conscience. The answer we give is a fair test, I submit, of the sincerity with which we pledge allegiance to the things that are genuinely American.

One word in this connection about the labor movement. It is my conviction that among the various institutions in the United States, none has made a more significant contribution to the improvement of race relations than organized labor. This is real leadership and I urge you to maintain it with even greater dedication and persistence.

COMMUNISM IS AN EFFECT

For too long have I abused your patience. One final thought. Again let me remind you that Communism is an effect not a cause. There never would have been this vicious threat to human decency and to human freedom everywhere, if we in America and throughout the Western world had not proved false to the sacred traditions of Christianity and democracy. The hour is late. How late I do not know. But it will soon be too late

unless we are courageous enough and humble enough to admit our own serious deficiencies. And this, followed by sincere determination to revitalize our political, economic and

social habits with the dynamic principles of justice and charity, opens up the way for the only counterrevolution which can withstand Communism and finally destroy it.



Opponents of Public Housing

It has been charged that the opposition to public housing came from those who made money out of operating slum properties and from those who were glad to accept FHA and other aids to builders, but who didn't want anyone else to get help. In my opinion, there are at least two other sources of opposition. The first is the small group of men who have used public housing as a whipping boy—a straw man—to create powerful organizations like the National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The other is organizations like the United States Savings and Loan League and the Mortgage Bankers of America, many of whose members are rugged individualists. Their basic philosophy is, "I came up the hard way—the government must be kept out of business." They are not concerned with what happens to people or to cities—that is not relevant to their philosophy.—*Ira S. Robbins in JUSTICE, New York, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1953.*



Novenas and Religion

Novenas are not essential to religion. Nevertheless, they do have their place, as anyone who believes in the Communion of Saints must admit.

Certain superficial individuals may confuse values and elevate novenas to a position of prominence they do not deserve. These are the people who never miss a novena and never go to Sunday Mass.

Such persons are in the minority. They do not in any way represent the larger group who never for a moment lose sight of what is essential, necessary and irreplaceable. They revere the Mass, receive the Sacraments and adore only God. Their every action proclaims the awe with which they approach the Almighty.

Aware of their own unworthiness and mindful that giants of the spiritual order are more influential above, they beg these giants in their novenas to present their petitions to the ever Blessed Trinity.—*CATHOLIC LIGHT, Scranton, Pa., July 30, 1953.*

The Vocation of Work

REV. C. PRIDGEON, S.J.

Catholic Social Guild, Oxford, England.

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX**

IT IS a difficult and a delicate task to talk about vocation-in-work: difficult, because the chances are that a public audience will find the subject above their heads; delicate, because if they do understand what the speaker is about they are likely to suspect that they are being preached at. The mental reaction in the one case is nil, and in the other it is at best mildly or respectfully antagonistic. Neither atmosphere is helpful to a discussion of the subject. It is for these reasons that the following considerations have been set down as an article. There is a better chance that the subject will evoke the discussion it deserves if it is there to be read and pondered. Not that the ideas set down here are in any way final—far from it. If they should appear somewhat novel, the excuse offered is that the topic itself is novel; at least it has not figured as largely as it should in the list of “social problems.”

The message (if it may be so called) of a vocation-in-work is obviously intended primarily for the ordinary workingman or woman, for those whose work in modern indus-

trial conditions is classed as “unskilled”—more accurately, perhaps, those whose work is repetitive, monotonous, and requiring little judgment and rarely any decision. But the subject is no less important for those occupied in trades or callings that are highly skilled, that call for craftsmanship or creative effort.

To the ordinary workingman, the suggestion that there can be something as sacred as “vocation” about so humdrum a thing as his job sounds ridiculous, almost blasphemous. The more sceptical will point to assembly belts and the long line of monotonous tasks which grind on eight hours a day, five days a week and fifty weeks a year. The soulless machine inexorably dries up the soul of the man who tends it; and he gradually becomes just another part of the machine, essential to its smooth working but no more than that. He is not essential in himself, as a man: he has no value. If he breaks down, there is another to take his part—like a spare part: and the machine goes on. How, in such conditions, can one talk about vocation?

Painting the contrast so sharply makes the idea sound utopian. But may it not be that this is the fault, not of the idea, but of the meaning we tend to give to the word "vocation"? If that is the case, it is worthwhile looking at the word more closely and trying to see, in the light both of reason and of faith, what its essential, true meaning is. There are grounds enough in all conscience for attempting this, as we shall show.

MEANING OF VOCATION

In Catholic practice vocation has come to have a highly specialized meaning. We instinctively think of the priest, the monk, the nun or the missionary: those specially chosen souls set apart from us ordinary mortals. In the same mental breath, so to speak, we are inclined to exclaim, "Not for the likes of me!" and go on our way with a sigh of relief. Thus the whole idea of vocation drops out of our minds—and for all practical purposes out of our life: out of *my* life. Yet we readily admit that a vocation is something *good*. So what happens is that something good passes right out of our life. That is not healthy: nor is it Christian.

Again, if we ask ourselves what it is that specially marks a vocation, how we would describe it, we should agree that it means in essence living a way of life with a definite purpose—a clearly-seen, freely-accepted purpose or goal that is good, noble and

true to the highest and best in human nature. How often, for instance, does a priest or religious hear it said: "You're all right. You know what you are cut out for: you know what your life's work is, and it all adds up to something worth while. That is what keeps you going and gives you peace of soul." Agreed, then, that vocation stands for all that is noble and good and that it does draw out the best in human nature. If, however, we regard vocation as something not for us, we are to that extent putting right out of our life something capable of inspiring us, of raising us to the highest and best that can be achieved—natural and supernatural. Again, that is not healthy: nor is it Christian. For, in effect, it means that we are dropping out of life *the one thing that makes sense of life*. Or put it another way: by emptying life of this good thing, life itself droops, withers, dries up.

Is it to be wondered at, therefore, if, as a result of such an attitude of mind, our life becomes drab, routine, dull and mechanical; that we gradually lose our clear vision of life and narrow it down to the day that is with us, living for the day in that peculiarly passive, fatalistic mood that is so common today? And may there not be here a close connection between such a mood or mental habit and the materialistic outlook which is seeping into the lives of people—even amongst Catholics? One might go

further. The rabid materialism of the Communist is, by a strange perversion of the human mind, supercharged with an idealism, with a sense of purpose, for all its evil: in fact it is just this dynamic feature about it that makes it so virulent. But the materialism which is, so to speak, only one step removed from the narrowed, purposeless outlook we are speaking of, is a negative thing—passive, flabby and static. It is the result of being without an ideal or a vision: it is soulless, dead matter: and that means it is liable at any moment to succumb to the virulent materialism of the Communist. Even if a man has lost his ideals, idealism still remains, for it dies hard in human nature; and Communism can revive it for him.

SOCIAL UNREST

These reflections are not by any means irrelevant to the subject. It is comparatively easy to test what has been said about the effect on men's outlook of not being "vocation-minded"; we have only to glance at some of the more obvious symptoms of unrest in social and industrial life. There are hundreds of thousands who seem to drift through life aimless, soured and cynical. Psychiatrists will tell us it is "frustration"—and they are right—but that itself is only the symptom and not the disease. Frustration does indeed go far to explain the many "eruptions" that disturb the surface of social life; various in-

stances of juvenile delinquency; the ever-growing frequency of "token" and "unofficial" strikes on the pettiest of pretexts; the appeal to class-war, which runs like an undertone through the disharmonies of industrial relations; and the ever-spreading virus of petty selfishnesses—all these are indications that deep down something is badly amiss. But the social reformer who diagnoses it as maladjustment of social environment and endeavors to improve the victim's circumstances is missing the point: it is not life that is out of joint, it is the human person. The re-adjustment has to take place inside him, his outlook on life must be re-shaped, his personality "integrated" as they say. That cannot be done without providing a purpose which will satisfy his reason and engage his will.

It would be a mistake to attribute the disturbances mentioned above solely to the maddening monotony of workaday life. After all, modern life seems to provide compensation for monotony in the bewildering variety of interests and leisure occupations which the ordinary person can indulge in quite innocently without harm to himself. Disruptive activities are not the only way for the person who is "fed up." It is not difficult to think of many kinds of employment, every bit as routine as any in our industrial factories, which do not exacerbate us with a sense of frustration—types of occupation in which (be

it noted) the sense of personal achievement and of purpose prevails against the monotony. Farming is a case in point. There is routine there, but there is no drift because the work is in a special way personal: the farmer enjoys the fruits of his success and pays for his mistakes; the work of his hands is there for him to see and appraise; there is something of himself. And there is a sense of purpose in it all; there has to be, otherwise he is forced to pack up and try his hand elsewhere.

The same is equally true of any of the handicrafts; there the operations in themselves are without doubt monotonous and repetitive, but there is another element which makes all the difference—the sense of personal achievement, of pride in a good job of work. Yet the pride of craft is not just an afterglow of satisfaction in a job well done: it is something in the workman himself that inspires and sustains his effort from the outset of a job.

If, then, we can restore to our working lives a sense of purpose and stir ourselves to respond to it by deliberate personal choice, we shall be in a position to argue for vocation-in-work as a practical possibility in our ordinary life and not, as so many seem to do, dismiss it as a sentimental pipe-dream.

It is at this point that the Catholic ought to bring into play the full power of his faith, not merely be-

cause it is the light which illumines the darkness, but because by its light alone can he see his life in its true color. The color indeed will be seen to be so rich that we shall need to remind ourselves that it is also true, alone true.

GOD'S CALL

The first thing about a vocation is that it is a "call," and a call is something which comes to me from *outside*, from someone else. At once we observe that the *internal* aspect of it—in other words, my character, talents, dispositions, etc.—is quite secondary in importance. There is something encouraging in that. But further, for a call to have any serious claim on my attention it must come from a person who has the right, the power and authority to call me along a certain path of action. And the only person who has such a claim in its fullness, who can call any and every man to a path in life is God, because He made all and each and is supreme Master. Moreover, being infinitely wise, God has a purpose in all He does and therefore His creation of the world, of each person in particular, is not a mere demonstration of power, much less some kind of whim or joke. Consequently, I as an individual can say that in a true sense I am important to God, important to His external glory, a witness to His power and providence. But more, I am supremely important in myself, to me, simply be-

cause I am I and not some other person He has created.

If we bear this in mind, the staggering fact that there are millions of people, of individuals, is of less importance than the fact that each of them comes under this call from God, that the one thing all have in common is a purpose which God has for them. In other words we all have the same vocation. Its concrete expression will of course differ for each individual person, for no two persons are alike (each is unique); but the overriding common purpose is, to quote the Catechism: "to know, love and serve God *in this world . . .*" That is God's purpose for all men: that is mankind's vocation in the true sense of the word, for it is man's way to God through life.

Perhaps it would be well to stress the distinction which is being made here. We should talk about "vocation" only in the sense described above. But when we start talking about the priesthood or religious life, etc., we are talking about vocations (in the plural), for these are only particular ways in which certain individuals are, under God's providence, carrying out the general vocation laid upon all men. Admittedly, this idea of vocation and vocations is incomplete as it stands, for it does not solve the question uppermost in each one's mind, namely, "How am I to know how to carry out my vocation?" We are each so different in our views,

in our ways, that it is all too easy to misunderstand just how we are each expected to express this vocation in our own circumstances. It is at this point that we want an authoritative answer.

A word is necessary to forestall a likely criticism. This is not an attempt to deal with the whole subject of vocation, much less of vocations: it is not meant as a guide to help individuals to decide what their particular vocation is. Primarily it is dealing with those millions whose path in life is already fixed, those who are working for their living and have life-long responsibilities already on their hands; and to these it is hoped to show how their present condition amounts to a genuine vocation. That is all.

CHRIST OUR MODEL

Now the authoritative answer that we need to the question just raised is —Christ Our Lord, God-made-Man. Without going into any detail on this central mystery of our faith, we can say quite simply that Christ is the perfect model in all respects for us human beings. He Himself declared "I am the way, the truth and the life," and that means He is the perfect way to God—the only way. He is the ideal of what vocation means, for while we realize that the way to God means for us getting closer to God, growing *like* Him (a thing we can experience in human affairs, even as we do in

love), we also realize that this ideal of union-with-God is a living reality at an infinitely higher level—in the Hypostatic Union. There human nature and divine nature are one in the Person of God the Son. So Christ is the ideal and the goal of our vocation.

But Christ Our Lord is more than a model (a word which is likely to make us think of Him as something static, a statue, fixed and set). At the risk of irreverence, we may say that He is a "working model," if thereby the idea is conveyed that He is dynamic, living, acting now as always—"My Father worketh until now, and I work." We have to present Christ truly and therefore must present Him in the historic present, "ever living . . ."

As if to present this important feature of His work to us in words that cannot be misunderstood, He Himself explains: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you"—and if we take the words literally, this reads: "As the Father hath *apostled* Me, I also *apostle* you." Christ is sent by the Father to do a work; and He in turn (this is His mission) sends each of His followers to continue that work. My apostleship, being "apostled" by Him, is part of His apostleship, a task vividly described by St. Paul in *I Cor. 4, 9-13*. All the various avenues of life in which men are lawfully occupied are so many expressions of this universal apostleship, this carrying on by us of the work He came to

do but which must go on during the centuries through us: thus there are priests, monks, nuns, married, single; some praying, others laboring, others suffering—all make up the Body of Christ, the living, active Christ saving the world *now*, leading men now on the way to God.

Work, then, whatever kind it be, is an essential part of Christ's mission: *my work, my job*, is an essential part of His universal work of redeeming men and enabling all to fulfill their God-ordained vocation. So that my daily job has two aspects which make it a holy thing (and a noble thing)—it is my vocation, the way in which I draw closer to God by fulfilling the work given me by Christ; and it is the means by which Christ Our Lord extends and spreads His universal work through me to all mankind, indeed to all creation.

We can look at this another way. Granted that I have been apostled by Christ with a life-long work, it is fantastic that half of my earthly life (for that is the portion I spend earning my living or working at a job) should be outside this vocation, sheer waste. Reason and faith tell me this could not be so in God's wise providence.

There is of course a variety of ways in which we can approach the drab toil of our daily tasks in order to sanctify it; the sole object of the particular approach given here is to set the problem into the theology of the Incarnation because the Incarnation

—God-made-Man—is the only key to the meaning of life. Apart from it everything is meaningless.

Nevertheless it is useful to look at our task of daily work from another angle, namely, as something natural to us, part of our very nature. "Man is born to work as the bird to fly," said Leo XIII when explaining its dignity; and we should welcome any considerations which enable us to see the noble and the good side of work as against the soured and cynical view which looks on it as unadulterated drudgery and slavery.

COLLABORATION WITH GOD

By far the greater part of work done by people today for a living is classified as "production"; at least that is what goes on in manufacturing industries, however minute the part a man's particular job may be in relation to the whole process. If we can stand back for a while and survey this scene calmly, it is quite a remarkable operation. For what does it amount to? Man, we know, is created in the image and likeness of God; but he is a *living*, active likeness to God. Similarly, we know that although we speak of God as having created man, it is more correct to say that God *is* creating: He too is ceaselessly active. Just as God created the world, so man, working by the powers God gave him, works upon this "raw material" (for God did not create the world complete down to the latest

modern invention) and makes out of it more developed and finished products. Thus, in fashioning materials to his uses, man is faintly imaging forth the creative activity of God; he is expressing his "likeness" to God, and to that extent is being supremely true to his nature. This fashioning, developing, refining is not confined to what we call manufacturing; it works at higher levels, as in the educating of their children by parents, moulding and forming their mind, character, habits, etc. and we see this wonderful power at its most sublime in the activity whereby human beings produce (we say "procreate," and the word itself is significant) other human beings.

In this use of his powers on the material around him, whatever the particular process, man is expressing an essentially "god-like" characteristic, and it is possible to see in this fact the basis for asserting the *dignity* of work. Not that this lies in the materials used or in the process being done; the dignity lies in the fact that it is the activity of an image of God—a human being, a person. So that, no matter how common, dull, unimportant the job, it is the fact that I am doing it that gives it its essential value and dignity: just as—to return to the Incarnation-view—it is not *what* Christ did but the fact that it was Christ who did it that gave His least action infinite value.

Scripture confirms this view of

work, for God set our first parents in the paradise of pleasure and gave Adam the task "to dress it and to keep it" (*Gen. 2, 15*); and this was before they fell from grace. Work, then, is not a punishment for sin but an essential part of our nature; nor does supernatural grace do away with the necessity of it. But after the Fall there is a decided difference. Because of his sin, Adam is now told, "Cursed is the earth in thy work; with labor and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life." The punishment of sin, therefore, is not work but the toil, sweat and pain that accompany work; in a word the suffering which goes with it.

PRAISE TO GOD

But once more, lest we should succumb to all that our feelings and everyday experience teach us and resign ourselves to the suffering that accompanies our work as to an inescapable slavery, God comes to the rescue in the person of His Son. As St. Paul so graphically puts it, Christ took the "handwriting that was against us and nailed it to the tree" (the Cross), and in that supreme act of atonement Christ transformed the whole of creation. Henceforth, suffering, toil, labor and sorrow—the punishment for sin—are themselves transformed, caught up in that

mighty redeeming act and made over as part of the sacrifice of praise to God. Henceforth we, too, can weave even our suffering and the fatigue of our work into the one complete act of praise that we give God in our life of work.

Thus does our Faith "more wonderfully still renew our nature" because in its light and by its strength the one baffling mystery that seems to spoil life's pattern—suffering—is itself ingeniously woven into that pattern, and all is of a piece. Thus, too, does our Faith (if we but live it) transfuse the drab and dreary monotony of life and work and give it a dignity and price of eternal value.

The vocation of work and the dignity of work are two sides of the same coin. The mere statement of it as set forth here does not of course make it easy to practise the ideal. But, as was said at the outset, the fault we have tried to deal with is not so much one of the work itself which we do but of our attitude to it. And if these considerations in any way help us to look at our work in a better light, and to derive inspiration that will put a sense of purpose and vocation into our lives, then they will have contributed a little to lightening the load which seems to weigh so heavy on the shoulders of Christ's little ones, on us, His little flock.

Role of Labor Leaders

THE REV. JOSEPH F. DONNELLY

Chairman, Connecticut State Board of Mediation and Arbitration

Excerpt from an address to the 68th Annual Convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor, Bridgeport, Conn., September 2, 1953.

I WISH to talk to you not as Chairman of the Connecticut State Board of Mediation and Arbitration, nor as Director of the Diocesan Labor Institute, but as a priest who during the past fifteen years has been honored by God with the opportunity of working closely with the representatives and members of the organized labor movement in Connecticut.

This eve of Labor Day in 1953 finds the organized labor movement in America at the peak of its influence in industrial and economic life. More people are employed in America than at any time in the past. More employes than ever before are organized into trade unions. The standard of living for the large majority of our people is relatively good. On other problems, too, we have made progress. There is less substandard housing. Significant progress has been made in the field of interracial justice. Indeed much remains to be done in promoting social reform, but what has been done indicates that in one generation we have lived through

a significant phase of a social revolution. There have been no bullets in the streets and no barricades, but the change which has occurred since 1930 in industry, in economics, in social thought has been nothing less than a revolution.

To what has happened in this field all informed Americans look back with considerable satisfaction. But the group which can look back with particular satisfaction are you in the American labor movement. You, and those who carried on before you, are the ones who dreamed most dearly of the change and who gave their efforts, and their energy, and sometimes their lives, to promote it. Indeed on this Labor Day you should pause and look to the past with satisfaction. The laurels are many and they should be carried proudly.

But you should be mindful that the change and the manner of the change have brought many misunderstandings and some enmity. Millions of Americans know little or nothing of the American labor move-

ment. Many fear it and its influence. And of course there are the old enemies whose attitude is due to reasons less worthy than misunderstandings. Because these are facts I remind you that for some of our people you and your local union are the labor movement. You may be all they know of the labor movement, and because of this your responsibilities are great. What you do for good or for evil reflects on the entire labor movement and makes for it either enemies or friends.

Today organized labor must win better understanding, confidence and respect among our people generally. Its responsibilities to the public and to employers must be carefully and faithfully executed. Unionism must be open and honest. If it must fight for its rights, it must also protest and condemn every violation of the rights of others. At the present state of progress in the employer-employee relationship I believe that labor should strive to make very remote indeed the use of its economic strength in industrial disputes. Labor must promote responsibility among its membership, and a pressing need today is the effective discipline of those workers whose performance on the job falls carelessly short of the standards which you, their leaders, approve and agree upon. You representatives assembled here in this 68th Convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor carry much of

the responsibility of the labor movement in Connecticut in your hands. You must carry it faithfully.

SERVING GOD

Now I would leave with you one last thought, a thought which has troubled me over the years and one which time has carried to a conviction. We are all on earth to serve God and some day go back to God. Each of us in his own way must work out his salvation. It is my conviction that the opportunities of serving God, of meriting a reward from God are abundantly present to you as leaders of organized labor, but that far too often these opportunities go unrecognized and unused.

Our Lord told us that the greatest commandment is that we love God, and that the second great commandment is that we love our neighbors as ourselves. He told us that we are all brothers under God and that "inasmuch as you did it to these my least brethren you did it also to Me." He told us that if we gave but a cup of cold water in His name, our good deed would have its reward. But if a cup of cold water is worthy of a reward, what of the life of service, what of the thousands of opportunities for service which come to you as labor leaders? Of course, you have a job to do, but of what tremendous personal spiritual value your job can be if you fire your purpose with love of God and love of your neighbor—

helping a poor lad who is in a jam on his job and may be on the verge of falling into the gutter; cooling the hot-head who might disrupt a responsible and satisfactory company-union relationship; working long and hard to organize a plant to give employees decent conditions of work and wages. If the cup of cold water wins a reward, surely all these services to the poor, the needy and the abused will win from God a tremendous reward.

So I encourage you to bring to your job this added spiritual motiva-

tion. Seize the opportunity to do the good turn, to be of service. Do not cut the corners, for on the corner cut away may be one who suffers, a family in need, or a segregated fellow human who is our brother in Christ, regardless of race, or color, or condition of body or wallet.

May I tell you how pleased I have been with the opportunity of being with you and encouraging you to carry on, giving your best to your organization, to the labor movement, to your fellow man and to God.



Labor's Functional Role

Most unions were born as the result of injustice. They had to fight hard to win concessions and better living conditions for the worker. It is not surprising then that a mentality of struggle and warfare still permeates many of them. In some instances they have become specialized groups seeking to obtain specific benefits for their members without a coherent philosophy of the larger aspects of society and its structure.

As long as an unrestrained profit-motivation permeates American life, industrial peace and unity will remain wishful thinking. The next step forward must be one that will embody explicit Christian values and ideals. If labor would take the initiative and stress its functional role, not only would it solve its own internal problems but it would be doing pioneer work in the arduous task of reconstructing society in line with the common good, common peace and common happiness.—*Raymond H. Potvin in THE CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield, Mass., September, 1953.*

Documentation

International Penal Law

POPE PIUS XII

Address to the Sixth International Congress of Penal Law, October 3, 1953.

IT SEEKS to Us that very rarely has so important and select a group of jurists and specialists in the science and practice of law, from the whole world, been gathered together in the house of the Pope, as that which We see assembled around Us today. Our joy in wishing you welcome to Our home is all the greater for it. This greeting is addressed to each of you individually and to the whole of your Sixth International Congress of Penal Law, which during these recent days has been extremely active. We take a deep interest in the results of your congress, and We feel Ourselves obliged to make some considerations of principle concerning its objectives and resolutions. We hope, in so doing, to respond to the wishes expressed from among you to Us.

A peaceful and ordered social life, whether within a national community or in the society of nations, is only possible if the juridical norms which regulate the living and working together of the members of the society are observed. But there are always to be found people who will not keep to these norms and who violate the law. Against them society must protect itself. Hence derives penal law, which punishes the transgression and, by inflicting punishment, leads the transgressor back to the observance of the law violated.

States and peoples have each their own penal law; these laws are made up of multitude of parts; between them there always remains a greater or less diversity. But since in our times people easily change their place of residence and frequently pass from one state to another, it is desirable that at least the most serious crimes should have a sanction everywhere and, if possible, of an equal severity, so that the culprits may nowhere be able to escape or be shielded from the punishment of their crimes. It is an agreement and reciprocal support of this kind between nations that international penal law strives to realize.

If what We have just said holds good in normal times, its urgency is particularly evident in time of war or of violent political disturbances, when civil strife breaks out within a state. The offender in political matters upsets the order of social life just as much as the offender in common law: to neither must be allowed assurance of impunity in his crime.

To protect individuals and peoples against injustice and violations of the law, by formulating an international penal code, is a lofty aim to the attaining of which We wish to contribute by addressing a few words to you.

I. Importance of the Law

We will speak first of all of the importance of international penal law, as brought out by the experience of the last decades.

This experience covers two world wars with their repercussions. During these changes, both within countries and between one country and another, and when totalitarian political regimes were developing without check, deeds were done governed only by the law of violence and success. We were witnesses then of a cynical attitude, which would be unthinkable in normal times, in attaining the end proposed and in neutralizing the enemy, who was in general hardly considered as a human being. It was not blind natural forces but men who, now in savage passion, now in cold reflection, brought unspeakable sufferings, misery and extermination to individuals, communities and to whole nations.

Those who acted thus felt secure, or tried to procure for themselves the assurance that no one could ever or in any place call them to account. If fortune turned against them, it would be always possible for them to flee to a foreign country. Such was the attitude of soul of those who acted as criminals themselves, or, presuming on their power, commanded and forced others to act, or let them commit evil, even though they could and were obliged to restrain them from it.

All this created among those involved the impression that no law existed, of a lack of protection, of being the playthings of an arbitrary will and of brute force. But a demand also made itself felt: that all the culprits of which We have just spoken, without consideration of persons, should be obliged to render account, to suffer the penalty, and that nothing should be allowed to save them from the chastisement of their acts, neither success nor even the excuse of an "order received from a higher authority."

It is the spontaneous human sense of justice that demands a sanction, and which perceives that the threat of an universally applicable penalty is a guarantee, not to be neglected even though not infallible, against such wrongdoing. This sense of justice has, on the whole, found for what concerns offenses of common law a sufficient expression in the penal code of states; to a lesser degree, in the case of political violence within states; and hardly at all, up to the present, for acts of war between states and peoples.

But a balanced sense of justice is no less clear and imperious in its demand for sanctions in the last-mentioned case than in the others, and if it is satisfied, it will be equally strong in its restraining force. The certitude, confirmed by treaties, that one must render an account—even if the criminal act succeeds, even if the offense is committed abroad, even if, after having committed it, one flees to a foreign country—this certitude is a guarantee not to be underestimated. The consideration of these circumstances is calculated to make one understand, even at first sight, the importance of an

international code of penal law. For, in fact, we are not dealing here with the simple demands of human nature and of moral duty, but with working out clearly defined coercive juridical norms which, in virtue of formal treaties, may become obligatory for the contracting states.

II. Crimes

In the second place We shall speak of the categories of crimes which will concern international penal law.

If already the common penal law must apply the principle that it cannot take as its object all acts against morality but those only which seriously threaten good order in the life of the community, this same principle deserves very particular attention in the construction of an international system of penal law (cfr. St. Thomas of Aquin., *Summ. Theol.* 1. 2ae., q. 96, a.2 and 1). It would be an undertaking doomed before hand to failure to try to set up international agreements covering all violations of law, however slight. In this matter, attention must be directed only to crimes that are particularly serious, even only, We might say, to those which are extremely serious. It is only for such crimes that it is possible to establish a uniform penal code between states.

Besides, the choice and definition of the crimes to be punished must be based on objective criteria: namely, on the serious nature of certain crimes, and on the necessity to take measures precisely against them. In the light of these two considerations it is of paramount importance to consider the following points:

1. The value of the good attacked; it should be something of the highest importance.
2. The force of the inclination to violate the good.
3. The intensity of the evil will which is normally exercised when these crimes are committed.
4. The gravity of the perversion of juridic order, considering the person who commits the crime; for example, in the case where those who should maintain law, themselves break it.
5. The seriousness of the threat to the juridic order because of extraordinary circumstances which, on the one hand, increase the danger of criminal acts being attempted and, on the other, make them much more formidable in their effects. Consider, for example, extraordinary situations, such as war or siege.

With these criteria as a base, a number of cases can be mentioned for which international law ought to establish a sanction.

In the first place, there is the crime of making a modern war which is not required by absolute necessity of self-defense, and which brings with it, as We can assert without hesitation, unthinkable ruin, suffering and horrors. The community of nations must reckon with unprincipled criminals who, in order to realize their ambitious plans, are not afraid to unleash total war. This is the reason why other countries, if they wish to preserve their very existence and their most precious possessions, and unless they are pre-

pared to accord free action to international criminals, have no alternative but to get ready for the day when they must defend themselves. This right to be prepared for self-defense cannot be denied, even in these days, to any state. That, however, does not in any way alter the fact that unjust war is to be accounted as one of the very gravest crimes which international penal law must proscribe, must punish with the heaviest penalties, and the authors of which are in every case guilty and liable to the punishment that has been agreed upon.

The world wars through which humanity has lived, and the events which have taken place in the totalitarian states, have given rise to many other evils, at times even more serious, which a code of international penal law should render impossible, or from which it ought to free the community of nations.

Also, even in a just and necessary war, the ways of acting which would lead to victory are not all defensible in the eyes of those who have an exact and reasonable concept of justice. The mass shooting of innocent people in reprisal for the fault of an individual is not an act of justice, but an injustice, sanctioned indeed by authority. One does not acquire the right to execute innocent hostages just because it is looked on as a necessity of war. In these last decades we have seen massacres out of racial hatred; the horrors and cruelties of concentration camps have been revealed to the whole world; we have heard of the "liquidation" by hundreds of thousands of "beings not fit to live"; pitiless mass deportations in which the victims were delivered up to destitution, often along with their wives and children; force used against great numbers of defenseless young girls and women; manhunts organized among civilians in order to procure workers, or rather slaves for work.

The administration of justice has in places degenerated into an unlimited arbitrariness, whether in the methods of examination, or in the sentence, or in the carrying out of the sentence. In order to be revenged on one whose actions were perhaps morally irreproachable, they have not at times been ashamed to take action against the members of his family.

These few examples—you know that many others exist—can suffice to show what class of crimes ought to constitute the object of international agreements, which could secure effective protection, and which would indicate clearly the crimes to be proscribed and fix their characteristics with juridic precision.

III. Penalties

The third point which calls for at least a brief mention concerns the penalties to be demanded by international penal law, about which a remark of a general nature will suffice.

It is possible to punish in a way that would hold the penal law up to ridicule; but it is also possible to punish in a way that surpasses all reasonable measure. In the case where human life is made the object of a criminal gamble, where hundreds and thousands are reduced to extreme want and

driven to distress, a mere privation of civil rights would be an insult to justice. When, on the contrary, the violation of a police regulation, a thoughtless word against authority, are punished by the firing squad or by forced labor for life, the sense of justice revolts. The fixing of the penalties in penal law and their adaptation to the individual case should correspond to the gravity of the crimes.

As a rule the penal law of the various states enumerates the sanctions and defines the norms which determine them, or else it leaves this to the judge to do. But it will be necessary to try and secure, by international agreements, a settlement of these penalties, in such wise that the crimes mentioned in the agreements may not be at an advantage anywhere; that is to say, that their punishment be not less formidable in one country than in another, nor that there be hope of a more lenient judgment before one tribunal than before another. It would be impossible to impose such a settlement on states by force, but an objective exchange of views would, nevertheless, give the hope of attaining agreement bit by bit on essentials. There would be no invincible obstacle, except from a political system built, itself, on the aforementioned injustices which the international agreement is to prosecute. Whoever lives by injustice cannot contribute to the formulation of law, and he who knows himself to be guilty will not propose a law which establishes his guilt and hands him over to justice. This circumstance explains in some degree what happened when recognition was sought for "The Rights of Man," although there are other difficulties which proceed from entirely different causes.

IV. Juridical Guarantees

We will speak, in the fourth place, of juridical guarantees, of which there is question on several occasions in the program of your Congress.

The function of law, its dignity and the sentiment of equity natural to man all demand that from first to last punitive action should be based, not on arbitrary will and passion, but on clear and firm juridical rules. That means, first of all, that there is a judicial trial—at least summary, if there is danger in delay—and that the trial be not by-passed, in reaction against the offense, and justice thus presented with an accomplished fact. To avenge a bomb thrown by an unknown hand by machine-gunning the passers-by who happen to be in the road is not a legal way of acting.

The very first step in the punitive action, the arrest, must not be done wantonly, but must respect juridical norms. It is not admissible that even the most irreproachable citizen might be able to be arrested arbitrarily and disappear without a word into prison. To send someone into a concentration camp and keep him there, without any regular trial, is a mockery of the law.

The judicial investigation must exclude physical and psychic torture and narcoanalysis; first of all, because these methods violate a natural right, even if the accused is really guilty, and, secondly, because they too often give erroneous results. It is not unusual for them to end in the precise confessions desired by the court, and in the ruin of the accused, not

because the latter is guilty in fact, but because his physical and psychic energy is exhausted, and he is ready to make all the declarations required. "Rather prison and death than such physical and psychic torture!" We find abundant proof of this state of things in the spectacular trials well known to all of us, with their confessions, self-accusations and demands for pitiless chastisement.

It is about 1100 years since the great Pope Nicolas I, in the year 866, replied in the following manner to the question of a nation which had just come into contact with Christianity (*Nicolai primi responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum*, cap. LXXXVI, 13 Nov., 866—*Mon. Germ. hist.*, Epp. tom. VI, p. 595):

If a thief or a bandit is caught, and denies what is imputed to him, you say among you that the judge should beat him on the head with blows and pierce his sides with iron spikes, until he speaks the truth. That, neither divine nor human law admits: the confession must not be forced, but spontaneous; it must not be extorted, but voluntary; lastly, if it happens that, after having inflicted these sufferings, you discover absolutely nothing concerning that with which you have charged the accused, are you not ashamed then at least, and do you not recognize how impious your judgment was? Likewise, if the accused, unable to bear such tortures, admits to crimes which he has not committed, who, I ask you, has the responsibility for such an impiety? Is it not he who forced him to such a deceitful confession? Furthermore, if some one utters with his lips what is not in his mind, it is well known that he is not confessing, he is merely speaking. Put away these things, then, and hate from the bottom of your heart what heretofore you have had the folly to practice; in truth, what fruit did you then draw from that of which you are now ashamed?

Who would not wish that, during the long interval passed since then, justice had never departed from this rule! That it should be necessary today to recall this warning, given 1100 years ago, is a sad sign of the aberrations of judicial practice in the twentieth century.

FREEDOM FOR THE DEFENSE

Among the safeguards of the judicial action is also reckoned the freedom of the accused to defend himself, truly, and not just for form. Both he and his counsel must be permitted to submit to the court all that speaks in his favor. It cannot be allowed that the defense may only put forward what is acceptable to the court and to a biased justice.

An essential factor of the safeguards of the law is the impartial composition of the court of justice. The judge may not be biased, either personally or for the state. A judge who has a true sense of justice will himself renounce the exercise of his jurisdiction in a case in which he would consider himself to be an interested party. The "popular tribunals" which, in the totalitarian states, were composed entirely of members of the party offered no juridical guarantee.

The impartiality of the college of judges should also be assured, and especially when international relations are involved in the penal process. In such a case it may be necessary to have recourse to an international tribunal, or at least to be able to appeal from a national to an international one. One who is outside the quarrel feels there is something wrong when,

at the end of hostilities, he sees the conqueror judge the conquered for crimes of war, when the conqueror himself has been guilty of similar deeds towards the conquered.

The conquered may undoubtedly be guilty; their judges may have a clear sense of justice and the desire to be entirely objective; nevertheless, in such a case, the interest of the law, the confidence which the sentence is to command, will often require that neutral judges be added to the tribunal, and that the decisive majority depends on them. The neutral judge should not then consider that it is his duty to acquit the accused; he should apply law as it exists, and regulate his actions according to it.

But the afore-mentioned addition of neutral judges gives the parties immediately concerned, the disinterested third party and world opinion a greater certitude that "right" will prevail in the decision. It undoubtedly constitutes a certain limitation of private sovereignty, but this limitation is more than compensated for by the increase in prestige of, and by the added regard and confidence for, the judicial decisions of the state which acts thus.

DECIDING CULPABILITY

Among the safeguards demanded by the law there is none, perhaps, more important or more difficult to secure than deciding culpability. It should be an unassailable principle of penal law that the "penalty" in the juridical sense always presupposes a "fault." The simple relation of cause to effect does not merit to be considered as a juridical principle, sufficient in itself. This assertion does not in any way undermine the law. In the crime committed with an evil intention, the principle of causality is fully verified; the result—the "effectu secuto" of Canon Law—may, in fact, be required in order to be sure that a crime was really committed. But in penal law, causality and the resultant effect are only imputable if accompanied by culpability.

Here the judge meets with difficulties, even with great difficulties, to resolve which a conscientious examination of the subjective element is necessary. Did the author of the offense sufficiently know the illegality of his action? Was his decision to do it substantially free? In answering these questions one will be helped by the presumptions allowed for by the law. If it is impossible to establish the guilt with moral certitude, one will abide by the principle that "in doubt the presumption is in favor of the accused."

All this is already to be found in the simple criminal case. But the numerous trials of the war, and after the war up to our own day, have given the question a particular character. The judge had, and still has to study the case of those who have commanded others to commit a crime, or who have not prevented it when they could and should have done so. More often still there arises the question of the guilt of those who have only acted on the orders of their leaders, or were even forced to act under the threat of the direst punishments and even death. Very often, in these trials, the accused have pleaded the circumstance that they were only acting on "orders from above."

Would it be possible to secure by international agreements that leaders, on the one hand, be rendered juridically incapable of ordering crimes, and punishable before the law if they do so; on the other, that subordinates be dispensed from executing such orders, and punishable in the law if they obey them? Would it be possible to suppress by international agreements the juridical contradiction by which an inferior's property and life are threatened if he does not obey, and by which, if he obeys, he has to fear that at the end of hostilities the injured party, if he gains the victory, will hand him over to justice as a "war criminal"?

The moral principle in such cases is absolutely clear: no higher authority can validly command an immoral act; there exists no right, no obligation, no permission to accomplish an act, evil in itself, even if it is ordered, and even if the refusal to do the action involves the worst personal damages. This moral principle is not under discussion here. We are interested for the moment in putting an end to the juridical contradiction which We have mentioned by establishing, through international agreements, positive juridical rules, well defined and recognized by the contracting states as binding.

The same need for an international settlement exists for the principle of collective guilt, so often used and applied during recent decades, about which the judge had often to decide when determining the culpability of the accused, and which more often has served to justify administrative measures. States and tribunals which found in collective guilt a justification for their pretensions and maneuvers invoked the theory and applied it as a rule of action. Their opponents questioned its validity and even considered it unacceptable in any order of things established by man alone, because tainted with contradiction in itself and from the juridical point of view.

But here again, the ethical and philosophical problem of purely collective guilt is not at stake for the moment. We are concerned rather with finding and fixing a practical juridical formula to be adopted in case of conflict, and especially of international conflict, when collective guilt can be of decisive importance for determining culpability, and has been more than once. The safeguard of a regular juridical trial demands that in this conjecture the action of governments and of courts should be secured against arbitrariness and purely personal opinion, and be solidly founded in clear juridical rules: a foundation which corresponds to sane reason and to the universal sentiment of justice, and at the service of which the contracting governments may be able to put their authority and their power of coercion.

V. Foundations of Penal Law

To conclude We wish to say a word concerning some of the foundations of penal law:

1. The establishment of any positive law presupposes a series of fundamental needs existing in the nature of things.
2. The penal law must be built on man, considered as a personal, free being.

3. Only a person who is guilty and responsible to a higher authority may be punished.
4. The penalty and its application are in the last analysis postulates of the juridic order.

JURIDICAL POSITIVISM

1. The law is ultimately founded on the stable and immutable nature of things. Wherever there are men and nations gathered in communities with laws, are they not precisely human beings with a nature which is essentially the same? The needs which derive from that nature are the guide-rules of law. However different the formulation given to these needs in positive law, according to various times and places or varying degrees of development and culture, their central kernel is always the same, because it is the expression of man's nature. Those needs are, as it were, the dead point of a pendulum. Positive law swings beyond the dead point, now on one side, now on the other; but whether it likes it or not, the pendulum always returns to the dead point fixed by nature. It is of little consequence whether these needs of nature are called "law," "ethical norms," or "postulates of nature." The fact is that they exist; that they have not been invented by man's caprice; that they are really rooted in the nature which man himself did not fashion; that they are therefore to be found everywhere; and, consequently, all public law and all law of nations find in our common human nature a clear, solid and durable foundation.

It follows from this that any kind of extreme juridical positivism cannot be justified in reason. This positivism is expressed in the principle: "The law is whatever is established as such by the legislative power in the national or international community, and nothing but that, quite independently of any fundamental need of reason or nature." If one urges that principle, there is nothing to prevent a logical or moral contradiction; that unbridled passion, the whim and brutal violence of a tyrant and criminal might become the law of what is right. History, unfortunately, furnishes many examples of this possibility become reality. If, on the contrary, juridical positivism is so understood that, while recognizing fully those fundamental needs of nature, the term "law" is only used for laws formulated by the legislature, then many may consider this use of the word inexact; but, nevertheless, it offers a common basis for the construction of an international law founded on the ontological order.

MAN, A PERSONAL BEING

2. There is an essential difference between the juridical and the physical order of things. In the physical order, nature works automatically; not so in the juridical order, where man's personal decision must intervene, in conforming his conduct to the order established by law. "Man is the arbiter of each of his personal acts" is a phrase that expresses an ineradicable human conviction. Men will never admit that what is called the autonomy of the will is only a tissue of internal and external forces.

There is much talk today of security measures destined to replace the

punishment for the crime or to accompany it, of heredity, of natural dispositions, of education, of the extensive influence of the instincts at work in the depths of the unconscious or subconscious. Although such considerations may lead to useful conclusions, let us not gloss over the plain fact that man is a personal being, endowed with intelligence and free will, who decides finally himself what he will do or not do. This does not mean that he is free from every internal or external influence, from every inclination and attraction; nor does it mean that he has not to struggle to keep the right path, daily to fight a difficult battle against instinctive, and perhaps unhealthy, urges. But it does mean that, despite all the obstacles, the normal man can and must assert his will; and it is the normal man who must serve as the rule for society and law.

Penal law would have no sense if it did not take into consideration this aspect of man, but penal law makes complete sense because this aspect is true. And since this aspect of man, personal and free, is a conviction of humanity, the effort to establish a uniform penal code has a solid basis.

GUILT

3. A third presupposition of penal justice is the factor of guilt. It is this which ultimately distinguishes justice properly so called from administrative measures of security. By it the penal juridical order is guaranteed against all arbitrariness, and safeguards for the accused are defined and assured.

Penal law is a reaction of the juridical order against the delinquent; it presupposes a causal relationship between the latter and the former. But this causal relationship must be established by a delinquent who is culpable.

The importance of culpability, of its presuppositions and its effects in law, demands, especially on the part of the judge, a profound knowledge of the psychological and juridical process at its origin. Only on this condition will the judge be spared the painful incertitude which weighs on the doctor, who is obliged to take a decision, but who can make no certain diagnosis according to the symptoms of the sickness because he does not perceive their internal connection.

At the moment of the crime, the delinquent has before his eyes the prohibition imposed by juridical order. He is conscious of it and of the obligation it imposes. But, nevertheless, he decides against his conscience, and to carry out his decision commits the external crime. That is the outline of a culpable violation of the law. By reason of this psychological process the action is attributed to its author as its cause. He is guilty of it because his decision was conscious; the order is violated and its guardian, the state, demands an account of him; he falls under the penalties fixed by the law and imposed by the judge. The many influences exercised on the acts of intelligence and will, that is to say, on the two factors which are the essential constitutive elements of culpability, do not fundamentally alter this process, however great their importance in determining the gravity of the guilt.

The outline sketched above is always valid, because it is taken from

the nature of man, and from the nature of a culpable decision. It provides a common basis for international discussions, and may be of use in the formulation of juridical rules to be incorporated in an international agreement.

The deep knowledge of these difficult questions also prevents the science of penal law from digressing into mere casuistry, and, on the other hand, it directs it in the use of that casuistry necessary in practice, and thus justifiable.

If, however, men refuse to base penal law on culpability as an essential element, it will be difficult to create a true penal law and to reach an agreement in international discussions.

PUNISHMENT

4. It remains to say a word about the ultimate meaning of punishment. Most modern theories of penal law explain punishment and justify it in the last resort as a protective measure, that is, a defense of the community against crimes being attempted, and at the same time, as an effort to lead the culprit back to observance of the law. In these theories, punishment may indeed include sanctions in the form of a diminution of certain advantages guaranteed by the law, in order to teach the culprit to live honestly; but they fail to consider expiation of the crime committed, which itself is a sanction on the violation of the law, as the most important function of the punishment.

It may be permitted to a theory, to a juridical school, to national or international penal legislation to define punishment philosophically in the way in which they understand it, in conformity with their juridical system, provided that they respect the considerations developed above concerning the nature of man and the essence of guilt.

But from another point of view, and indeed a higher one, one may ask if the modern conception is fully adequate to explain punishment. The protection of the community against crimes and criminals must be ensured, but the final purpose of punishment must be sought on a higher plane.

The essence of the culpable act is the free opposition to a law recognized as binding. It is the rupture and deliberate violation of just order. Once done, it is impossible to recall. Nevertheless, in so far as it is possible to make satisfaction for the order violated, that should be done. For this is a fundamental exigency of "justice," whose role in morality is to maintain the existing equilibrium, if it is just, and to restore the balance, when upset. It demands that by punishment the person responsible be forcibly brought to order. And the fulfillment of this demand proclaims the absolute supremacy of good over evil; right triumphs sovereignly over wrong.

Let us take the last step: In the metaphysical order, the punishment is a consequence of our dependence on the supreme Will, a dependence which is inscribed indelibly on our created nature. If it is ever necessary to repress the revolt of a free being and reestablish the broken order, then it is surely here when the supreme Judge and His justice demand it. The

victim of an injustice may freely renounce his claim to reparation, but as far as justice is concerned it is always assured to him.

This more profound understanding of punishment gives no less importance to the function of protection, stressed today, but it goes more to the heart of the matter. For it is concerned, not immediately with protecting the goods ensured by the law, but the very law itself. There is nothing more necessary for the national or international community than respect for the majesty of the law and the salutary thought that the law is also sacred and protected, so that whoever breaks it is punishable and will be punished.

These reflections help to a better appreciation of another age, which some regard as outmoded, which distinguished between medicinal punishment—*poenae medicinales*—and vindictive punishment—*poenae vindicativa*e. In vindictive punishment the function of expiation is to the fore; the function of protection is comprised in both types of punishment. Canon Law, as you know, still maintains the distinction, which attitude is founded on the convictions already detailed. Only it gives full meaning to the well known word of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Romans: "Non enim sine causa gladium portat; . . . vindex in iram ei qui malum agit" (*Rom. 13, 4*). ("It is not for nothing that he bears the Sword: he is God's minister still, to inflict punishment on the wrong-doer.") Here it is expiation which is brought out.

Finally, it is only the expiatory function which gives the key to the last Judgment of the Creator Himself, Who "renders to everyone according to his works," as both Testaments often repeat (cf. especially *Matt. 16, 27*; *Rom. 2, 6*). The function of protection disappears completely in the after-life. The Omnipotent and All-Knowing Creator can always prevent the repetition of a crime by the interior moral conversion of the delinquent. But the supreme Judge, in His last judgment, applies uniquely the principle of retribution. This, then, must be of great importance.

Whether or not, as We have said, one leaves to theory and practice the duty of defining the role of punishment in the narrower modern sense, or in the other broader one, it is possible for collaboration in either case, and one can look forward to the creation of an international penal code. But do not refuse to consider this ultimate reason for punishment merely because it does not seem likely to produce immediate practical results.

Our elucidations have followed the line of contact between law and its metaphysical foundations. We will be happy if thereby We have contributed something at least to the labors of your Congress for the protection and defense of man against crime and the ravages of injustice.

We will conclude by wishing all success on your efforts to construct a sane international penal code for the advantage of society, of the Church and of the community of nations.

May the Goodness and Mercy of God Almighty give you as a pledge of it His blessing.

Arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski

POPE PIUS XII

Address to diplomatic representatives accredited to the Holy See who visited His Holiness to protest in the names of their governments the imprisonment of the Primate of Poland, November 19, 1953. The Hon. Joseph P. Walshe, Irish Ambassador to the Vatican, spoke in the name of all the diplomats.

Mr. Ambassador:

Since the occurrence of the sad happenings which have prompted your present act, We have received, and are still receiving, from all sides testimonies of that solidarity whose motives you have just recalled and summarized in a few words. Filled, therefore, with great emotion, We welcome you here, together with the illustrious members of the diplomatic corps accredited to Us, who have authorized you to be their spokesman; and We thank you for having desired on this occasion to afford Us a precious consolation.

The harassment inflicted upon the most worthy Cardinal Wyszynski opens a new wound in Our heart, that, namely, of seeing yet another step taken, after so many others, on that sorrowful way which the valiant Polish nation has been walking for several years.

During the course of a history rich in high deeds, containing numerous pages illuminated by the purest heroism, that nation has often had the opportunity of showing how ardently she clings to the Faith which she first received now nearly a thousand years ago, at the time she began to acquire self-awareness, and from which nothing has ever since succeeded in separating her.

The experience of centuries proves it: true religious convictions and love of fatherland penetrate to the innermost depths of the soul of man, permeate its most intimate fibres and are counted amongst its most precious possessions. Far from being opposed, or even from being mutually discordant, these two sentiments draw from their reciprocal support unsuspected vigor. Moreover, do they not correspond to the most imperative and most natural exigencies of man, assuring his perfection and harmonious growth, both individual and collective, through respect for legitimate authority and international law?

In addition to love for their country, the Polish people have always cherished an unflinching fidelity to the person of the Roman Pontiff, and they have found therein the strength that helps them valiantly to defend their existence. We referred to this in 1944 when receiving representatives of the Polish Army who had come in the name of their fellow countrymen to offer Us the filial homage of "ever-faithful" Poland. We repeated it in Our letter of September 1, 1951, addressed to the Hierarchy and people of Poland; and, today as then, We vividly recall to Our mind Our recollection

—now beclouded by sorrow and anxiety—of that meeting in which the Archbishop of Gniezno and Warsaw reaffirmed to Us the unshakable fidelity of Poland to the tradition which binds it to the Holy See.

It is not to be wondered at that he who had taken upon himself the task of safeguarding the most sacrosanct values of his people should become the principal victim of those who hope, by striking the leader, to deliver the decisive blow that will put an end to a tenacious resistance.

For this reason We have received with gratitude your protest against an act which violates, not merely the rights of one man, but also those of an entire people, and which tends to eradicate from its conscience fundamental convictions.

Who is there who does not feel himself menaced by this renewed attack against the dignity of man? The nations which you represent are striving to safeguard those imprescriptible rights which alone make possible a social life worthy of that name. Their moral support will not fail, We feel sure, to sustain and encourage those who are valiantly bearing up under such grave attacks on their religious and political freedom, and who will find in their help new and powerful motives for hope.

The gravity of these present evils should cause no one to lose trust in a more promising future. Truth and justice are not merely words. They have the very power of God Most High, Who is their Sponsor and has constituted Himself their Defender and Who, in maintaining them, despite appearances, instills in the hearts of His children the certitude of the final triumph of peace in mutual esteem among peoples and generous agreement among those of good-will.

May Almighty God vouchsafe to you personally and to your respective countries to see the dawn of this day which all long for, and for which many are unhesitatingly offering today their sufferings and their lives.



Lazy Citizens

The political lethargy of Negroes is really discouraging. For years Negroes in the North have been vociferously agitating for the ballot for their cousins in the South, while neglecting to vote in their own home districts. Still, some colored politicians advise Negroes to stay away from the polls if they do not wholly approve of some candidate. It is difficult to imagine a lower descent into absurdity.

It is this political indolence, on the part of both white and colored citizens, that weakens the moral fibre of a nation and prepares it for dictatorship; not a swarm of bureaucrats or a pestilence of global planners. So long as the citizens are alert, the bureaucrats will be kept well in hand. A dictatorship, as Chesterton says, "is merely a tired democracy, in which the citizens, growing weary of vigilance, appoint a single sentinel to watch the city while the people sleep."—*Theophilus Lewis in INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., September, 1952.*

Function of Bankers

POPE PIUS XII

An address to delegates attending the International Congress on Credit Questions, October 24, 1951.

YOUR conduct, of which We are well aware, is a convincing proof of the lofty conception you have of your profession and your role. Above intelligent handling of funds, above even the mere financial interest of your banks and their clients, you place moral and social utility. You mark the border or, to be more exact, the crossroads where capital, ideas and labor encounter each other.

When those who fish in troubled waters stress and exaggerate opposition (between capital, ideas and labor), your task consists in putting them in touch with one another, in making them useful one to the other. Especially in what concerns credit, the chief object of your International Congress, you are councillors more than executives or agents of banking operations.

How much capital is lost through waste and luxury, through selfish and dull enjoyment, or accumulates and lies dormant without being turned to profit! There will always be egoists and self-seekers; there will always be misers and those who are short-sighted and timid. Their number could be considerably reduced if one could interest those who have money in using their funds wisely and profitably, be they great or small. It is largely due to this lack of interest that money lies dormant. You can remedy this to a great extent by making ordinary depositors collaborators, either as bond or share-holders, in undertakings whose launching and thriving would be of great benefit to the community, such as industrial activities, agricultural production, public works, or the construction of houses for workers, educational or cultural institutions, welfare or social service.

Boards of directors have been greatly criticized. Such criticism is justifiable insofar as the members of these boards envisage nothing but excessive increase of dividends. If, on the contrary, they have at heart the wise and healthy handling of capital, then, by doing this alone, they are performing a social activity of the first order. They are assuming an intense, moral and psychological task that is much different from the simple impersonal transactions at the desk or counter. Who knows, perhaps one day for such transactions some inventor will so perfect adding machines, these mechanical or electric brains, that the client will have nothing to do but press a button in order to carry out all the business that brings him to the bank. But what machine, however ingenious, what system, however smart, can ever take the place of the banker, the manager of a house of credit, who studies the client, explains to him, and makes him aware of, what may interest him in order to direct his cooperation, enabling him to follow intelligently the fortunes of the undertaking he supports? Does this not constitute a

social and moral activity of the greatest value, an activity that brings the most fruitful results?

In spite of everything, the investor wants an assurance that he will not lose the money he has subscribed. Without risking the honest return due on his investment, he also desires to make it a source of benefit for others and for society. This supposes, of course, that the undertaking merits his participation and that it is, essentially, of a nature to interest him because of its being in harmony with his personal disposition and taste. Here, then, is another aspect of your role.

A young inventor, a man with initiative, a benefactor of humanity comes to you for a loan. You must study him in order not to put the trusting lender into the hands of a utopian or crook, in order to avoid the risk of sending away a deserving borrower capable of giving immense services but merely lacking the necessary funds for carrying them out. You must weigh his worth, understand his projects and plans, help him if needs be with counsels and suggestions to prevent his acting imprudently, to make his idea more practical, to find out to whom to send and recommend him for a loan.

How many geniuses, how many intelligent, generous and active men die in misery, discouraged, survived only by their ideas—ideas which men more clever than they will exploit for their own profit? And then, there are all those people put into temporary difficulties through a bad year, a poor harvest, losses caused by war or revolution, sickness, or some other unforeseen and unforeseeable circumstance in which they are not at fault. Through a loan such men can rise again, set about working and, in time, pay off their debt. What material help, what moral comfort you could give to all these!

After what We have said, it seems superfluous to speak of the immediate result of the meeting of capital and ideas. In proportion to the importance of the capital and the practical value of the idea, the labor crisis will be more or less slowed up. The conscientious and hard-working laborer will find employment more easily; the growth of production will progressively, though perhaps slowly, lead toward an economic balance; the many inconveniences and disorders, deplorably resulting from strikes, will be lessened for the greater good of a healthy domestic, social and moral life. To a certain degree, however modest, the saving of money will become possible for a greater number of people, bringing with it all the many various advantages of which We spoke in an address on this subject on December 3, 1950.¹

The proud knowledge of partaking in so great a work of reconstruction must be an encouragement to you in the midst of your difficulties, worries and even opposition which, especially in times such as the present, cannot be lacking.

As for Us, gentlemen, We express Our deep appreciation of your work and the spirit directing it. And from Our whole heart We ask God to shower His graces on your labors, yourselves and your families.

¹ See *Catholic Mind*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1061 (May, 1951), pp. 330-331.

Dignity of Man

Annual Statement of the U. S. Hierarchy, November 21, 1953.

EVERY man knows instinctively that he is, somehow, a superior being. He knows he is superior to the land he tills, the machine he operates or the animals which are at his service. Even when unable to define this superiority in terms of "honor and dignity," if a man enjoys the fruits of his nobility, he is content and accepts that status as his due; lacking honor and dignity for any cause, a man is restless, depressed, even rebellious because something proper to him, as a man, is withheld or denied.

The Catholic Church has always taught and defended the natural dignity of every human being. She has preached the burden of individual responsibility and has insisted upon the importance of personal conscience. She has reminded mankind that there is a great division between "things" and "men." She has never forgotten that "things" were made for men and that "men" were made for God.

In thus holding up a mirror to men that they may see their own greatness and realize their personal dignity, the Catholic Church has taught that man's true honor is from God, has been enhanced spiritually by Divine grace and is preserved without degradation only when the honor and dignity of God Himself are first maintained.

Often in times past men have failed to live up to the honor of their state. They have degraded their dignity in many ways. But always until now, violence and vice, injustice and oppression or any other assaults on human dignity were recognized as abominations and were so abhorred.

It has remained for our day to at-

tempt to disregard human personality and to fortify such disregard with the force of legislation or the approbation of custom, as if a man were only a "thing." The present has been described as a rationally established inhumanity working with all the expedients of administrative and mechanical techniques.

Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his 1952 Christmas allocution, gave warning of the attempted mechanization of mankind and protested the stripping of personality from men by legal or social devices. The Bishops of the United States, conscious of the growing depersonalization of man, reaffirm man's essential dignity and reassert the rights which flow from it.

TRUE ROOTS OF HUMAN DIGNITY

Man's essential worth derives from a threefold source: from the fact of his creation, from the mode of his existence and from the nobility of his destiny.

The mere fact that any creature exists at all requires the creative and sustaining power of God. When God exercises this power to summon any possible reality into actual existence, that reality is thereby sealed with value from within. Such a dignity man shares with the animal and material world around him.

But his special type of existence confers on man a special claim to honor. Though immersed in a universe of fleeting and random sensations, he is endowed with an intellect able to pierce the flux of passing images and discover beneath them enduring patterns of truth. Though subjected to the pressures of his environment, and a prey to

unthinking appetites, he is endowed with a self-determining will capable of choosing wisely within the framework of law.

Intellect and will, then, are man's distinctive adornments. It is their distinctive role to allow a finite creature to grasp truth consciously and to choose goodness freely, and thus to mirror the Infinite Creator, Who is conscious Truth and absolute Goodness.

Man's natural honor, however, has been enhanced by grace, conferred at creation, lost through sin, but restored through the Incarnation and Redemption of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. When the Son of God took human flesh as an instrument of salvation, all human flesh was honored by His association with it. Through His death and resurrection Christ demonstrated the role and destiny, the honor and dignity of every man for whom He lived and suffered.

Since those days of Christ on earth, no man lives by his body alone, nor by the natural powers of his soul alone; every man is sanctified, made holy, made more worthy and more honorable by the enjoyment of the special spiritual life which flows from the Cross, or by the possibility that this life will one day be his, to raise him above the limitations of nature, to honor him in unending union with the God Who became man.

Such is the triple fountain of man's dignity. To the extent these truths cease to energize the sense of reverence in every man; assaults upon the majesty of the human person must increase and intensify. Heedless that his nature has God for its origin and destiny, and reason and revelation for its divinely commissioned guide, man will do what no other creature can—he will deny his true nature and will destroy all that is good within himself.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND THE BODY

Such a process of degradation is viciously at work in our own country, where the deification of the flesh continues to enlist new devotees. Through its liturgy of advertisement, entertainment and literature, this cult bids fair to corrode our national sense of decency.

When reason abdicates its sovereignty over bodily energies, their purpose is destroyed; and, by a sort of instinctive vengeance, they themselves become destroyers. Like wild animals, these energies are hard to tame, and remain dangerous even when tamed. But whatever lawful use an animal may serve, it is not wisdom for man to accept as his master the lion who seeks to devour him.

The Catholic Church, however, has never failed to accord the human body an immense measure of honor. She affirms that it was originally created by God; in one instance actually assumed by Him; in every instance meant to be on earth His special temple, and destined eventually to rejoin the soul in His Beatific Presence.

Whatever is uncompromising in her teaching about the body stems from her realism on two points: the body, though good, is not the highest good; and the undisciplined body is notoriously bad.

Other sacrileges against personality flow from errors less crude perhaps, but hardly less injurious. Such are some prevailing misceptions about society, economics, labor and education.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND SOCIETY

The practical social theory of the last century enthroned the individual but not the person. An individual can be a thing: as for instance an individual tree; but in virtue of his rational soul, a person is more than a thing. Yet the

depersonalized view of man gained ascendancy, and generated a society which was a crisscross of individual egotism, and in which each man sought his own.

Against this error our century has seen a reaction which has sought to overcome the isolation of man from man by imposing upon rebellious individuals a pattern of compulsory and all-embracing state organization, with unlimited power in the hands of civil government. Hence socialism in its various guises has appeared as forcible organization imposed upon the confusion which resulted from false concepts of human freedom.

The Christian concept of man, however, is that he is both personal and social. As a person he has rights independent of the state; as a member of society he has social obligations. Parents and society contribute to the making of a man, hence man is indebted to the social order. At the same time, since his soul comes not from society but from God, a man has rights which no society may violate.

The state is a creature of man, but man is a creature of God; hence the state exists for man, not man for the state.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND LIBERTY

The Christian view, then, avoids the opposing extremes of individualism and collectivism, both of which are grounded on false concepts of liberty—either the unfettered liberty of individualism, which gives the "individual" the right to ignore society; or the unfettered liberty of dictatorship, which gives the government the right to ignore the person by absorbing him into a race or class, thus destroying his freedom of choice.

The false liberty of individualism wrecks society by defining freedom as

individual license; the false liberty of dictatorship wrecks humanity by defining freedom as the right of the dictator to nullify the person—a right which he claims to derive from social necessity.

Concerning the results of such false notions of liberty, Leo XIII issued these warnings:

"The true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he pleases, for this would simply end in turmoil and confusion, and bring on the overthrow of the state . . . likewise, liberty does not consist in the power of those in authority to lay unreasonable and capricious demands upon their subjects, a course which would be equally criminal, and would lead to the ruin of the commonwealth."

Liberty in political life may be described as the condition in which the individual finds himself unhampered in the discharge of his duties and in the exercise of his rights.

Liberty, however, is something more than a political phenomenon as some disciples of free enterprise maintain. It is something more mature than that dream of rights without responsibilities which historic liberalism envisioned; it is certainly different from that terrorism of responsibilities without rights which Communism imposes.

It is something wiser than free thought, and something freer than dictated thought. For freedom has its roots in man's spiritual nature. It does not arise out of any social organization, or any constitution, or any party, but out of the soul of man.

Hence to the whole tradition of the Western world, liberty does not come essentially from improved conditions of living, either political or economic, but is rather the spring out of which better conditions must flow. A free spirit creates free institutions; a slave spirit

permits the creation of tyrannical ones.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND ECONOMICS

Closely connected with freedom and human dignity is the right of private property.

On the question of private property the aforementioned misconceptions of liberty beget two other extremes: first the belief that a man's right to property is absolute, and that he may do with it what he pleases, without regard for the moral law or social justice; and, secondly, the reactionary error of Communism, which denies all personal rights and lodges all property in the hands of the state.

The Christian position maintains that the right to property is personal, while the use of property is also social. Unrestrained capitalism makes its mistake by divorcing property rights from social use; Communism hits wide of the mark by considering social use apart from personal rights.

Much of our economic restlessness, however, is the festering of man's wounded dignity. Karl Marx himself was perceptive enough to see that "democracy is based on the principle of the sovereign worth of the individual, which, in turn, is based on the dream of Christianity that man has an immortal soul" (*Marx-Engels Historical-Critical Edition*, Karl Marx Institute, Moscow, Vol. I, No. I, p. 590).

Ignoring the testimony of both reason and revelation and believing the "dream" to be only a dream, modern men have tended to concentrate almost exclusively on economic security and to pursue it at times with the fervor of religious devotion.

Often the hope is voiced that man will turn to the cultivation of the spirit after all his economic needs are supplied. We are reminded of the delusion

of Jean Jacques Rousseau that man, good in himself, has been corrupted only by society. Marxism, changing the formula, gives the same false primacy to external circumstances—man's goodness will depend upon the economic system under which he lives.

But the exclusive dependence on economic security and social reform to right the wrongs of mankind is by no means confined to Marxism. It affects the thought of great masses of men who reject the fundamental tenets of Marxism.

While we have deep sympathy with all people in their craving for economic security and while we acknowledge the evils, individual and spiritual as well as social, which often flourish in a society when many are forced to live in conditions of degrading poverty, yet we cannot refrain from pointing out the fact that man's goodness is from within.

It depends upon man's personal convictions and upon his efforts aided by God's grace. Economic and social reform, to be effective, must be preceded by personal reform. The perfection of a society may not be measured by the moral goodness of the individuals who compose it; but the goodness of a society cannot rise above the goodness of its members.

The position of the Church relative to the economic order is based on the principle that the rights man possesses as an individual and the function he fulfills in society are inseparable. Many of the rights of the individual depend upon the function he fulfills in society.

Capital and labor from this point of view are related and made inseparable by the common good of society. This is a prime principle of social justice. The right of the capitalist to his business and to his profits and interests, and the

right of the laborer to his wages and his union, are both conditioned by their service to the common good.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND LABOR

It is only in the light of the spiritual worth of man that the dignity and importance of labor become evident.

Labor is not something detached from the rest of life. Economically, it is bound up with capital as a co-partner in production. Socially, it is bound up with leisure as an avenue to cultural enrichment. Spiritually, it is bound up with the soul's development and with salvation.

The worker is not a hand, as individualistic capitalism contends; not a stomach to be fed by commissars, as Communism thinks; but a person who through his labor establishes three relations; with God, with his neighbor and with the whole natural world.

First of all, work unites us to God, not only by its ascetic character and through the discipline it imposes on man by subjugating his lower passions to order and reason, but principally because, through the intention of the worker, the material universe is brought back again to God.

Second, labor is also the bond uniting man to man, a kind of school of social service, a base of human solidarity, a testimonial to man's insufficiency without his neighbor. In working with others, man ratifies his social dependence and performs an act of natural charity, because he helps create utility for others and thus promotes the happiness of his fellow men.

The Catholic view, it will be noted, here adds that labor must always be used, not to dissociate ourselves from our neighbor, but to unite us with him. The greater the material advancement of any country, therefore, the more en-

ergetic should be its spirit of neighborliness.

Finally, work unites us with nature. It does this by enabling us to share in the creative work of God and by making each of us, in the language of St. Paul, "a helper of God."

God, the supreme Artist, has communicated artistic causality to men, so that they can now make things and shape events to the image and likeness of their own ideas. The marriage of man's intelligence and will with the material world and the natural forces with which he is surrounded becomes a fruitful union, and from them is generated a culture.

MAN'S DIGNITY AND EDUCATION

In transmitting culture from generation to generation, it is the purpose of education to safeguard and develop the dignity of man.

At the end of the eighteenth century our first President spoke of religion and morality as indispensable supports of political prosperity.

At the end of the nineteenth century our highest court declared that "the reasons presented affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation."

What is true of our political prosperity and our nation is true as well of our Western culture in general. Yet everywhere modern education is being drained of moral content through the movement which is known as secularism. It has been well said that the education of the soul is the soul of education.

Therefore, when education tries to thrive in a religious and moral vacuum, and does not aspire to impart a set of principles and a hierarchy of values, it degenerates into a dead and deadening juxtaposition of facts.

And even worse. For though it tries

to thrive in such a vacuum, education can never really be neutral in practice. It has been truly said that "men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants."

Similarly, education must inculcate a religious and moral outlook, or it will inculcate a materialistic one. And there is no word for dignity in the vocabulary of materialism.

CONCLUSION

Every day in holy mass, Almighty God is addressed as He Who wondrously established the dignity of man and restored it more wondrously still. Only by regaining our reverence for God can we of America in the twentieth century

rediscover both our own value and the solid basis on which it rests.

We must at the same time expend every effort to see that this dignity is reflected in our sense of decency, made aware of itself by education, nurtured by society, guarded by the state, stabilized by private ownership and exercised through creative activity.

The alternative is increasing chaos. The words of a contemporary historian of culture may serve to summarize the issues at stake:

"Unless we find a way to restore the contact between the life of society and the life of the spirit, our civilization will be destroyed by forces which it has had the knowledge to create but not the wisdom to control."



"Prostitution" Is Widespread

When an advertising man tries to find a more persuasive line of ingratiation, the chances are that he will stimulate his already unruly imagination to a point damaging to his integrity as a man. When a lawyer concentrates on winning a case even to the exclusion of justice, he damages his moral sense, and therefore himself as well. A doctor who looks for a fat fee from a rich patient might prostitute his science in order to get it, and if he does he prostitutes himself as a scientist. Prostitution is always bad for character and it is not restricted to ladies. It is much more common among men.—From *THE MAKING OF A MORON*, by Niall Brennan (*Sheed and Ward*).

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Paul A. Reed

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.